Published quarterly on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXXVII, No. 1 April, 1947

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the Pacific LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
Atomic Bombs and Spiritual Forces	1
What is Essential Christianity?	2
New Methods of Matrimonial Reconciliation	4
St. Peter and the Popes	5
Clericalist Escapism	7
Broadsheets and Narrow Policies	8
The Poverty of the Clergy and its Remedy	9
In Memoriam: George Gordon Coulton	11
New Light on the Nature of Man. G. N. M. Tyrrell	14
The Remarriage of the Divorced. G. L. H. Harvey	19
The Bible and Woman. J. C. Hardwick	30
The 'Seven in the Tower.' A. T. Hart	36
Alfred Adler. The Editor	45
South Africa's Greatest Bishop. D. L. Scott	52
Brains Trust	61
Book Reviews:	
The Faith of a Psychologist	65
Martin Bucer	66
The Unity of the Bible	69
Dr. Glasson and the *Parousia*	71
The Incarnation	73
A Creed for Free Men	76
Did Jesus at His Baptism foresee His Passion?	79
A Psychological Plea for Humanism	84
Principal Wheeler Robinson	87
Correspondence	88—96

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 5/- net. Annual Subscription, 11s.

AMERICAN AGENT:

MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L. & R.).

The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible

An entirely new production, abreast of the latest research and discovery. Of importance to the specialist, but so designed as to serve any student of the Bible or of ancient history. 114 pages, 11×15½ inches; 33 maps in full colour, 2 in black and white; 77 photographs; 8 pages of indexes. Price 25*s.* net

THE WESTMINSTER SMALLER BIBLE ATLAS contains 16 of the coloured maps in a size 6¼×9½ inches, with index, for school use. 2*s.* 6*d.* net

A Christian Year Book

1947 edition. 312 pages. 5*s.* net

Completely revised and brought up to date. A popular reference book of places, people and events, societies, Churches and publications. An encyclopaedia of the Ecumenical Movement. Edited by HUGH MARTIN and E. A. PAYNE. The authors include many distinguished writers and Church leaders from many countries.

God's Action within the Soul

by F. H. ALLEN 6*s.* net

An examination of the necessity and the difficulties of the belief that God is in direct contact with the individual soul.

The Christian Message to the Hindu

by A. G. HOGG, D.D. 6*s.* net

An outstanding missionary thinker, and for many years Principal of the Madras Christian College, Dr. Hogg writes out of the experience of a lifetime's study of Hinduism in theory and practice.

The Era of Atomic Power

2*s.* net

The Report of the Commission appointed by the British Council of Churches to examine the new responsibilities which command of atomic energy throws on mankind and its challenge to the Christian conscience.

Send for our Spring list of publications

S.C.M. PRESS Ltd., 56 Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1

CAREY PRESS

In The Press

THE GATHERED COMMUNITY

R. C. WALTON

Who are these Baptists? What do they believe? What is their contribution to the World Church? Mr. R. C. Walton, in association with a group of younger ministers, makes a thoughtful contribution on the Baptist position in the Church

Cloth, Demy 8vo. 184 pages. 7/6 net, postage 6d.

THE PROPHETIC WORD

W. E. BOOTH TAYLOR

A picture of the Old Testament Prophets, set against the background of their time and showing the relevance of their message in the present world situation

Cloth, Demy 8vo. 112 pages. 7/6 net, postage 6d.

LONDON

95 Gloucester Place, W.1

THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1 APRIL Vol. XXXVII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Atomic Bombs and Spiritual Forces

Many millions of people must have listened in to the recent British broadcast talks delivered by eminent scientists and publicists on atomic forces, their discovery, nature, potential use and misuse. The talks possessed very high educational value, but they failed to solve the problem: How can we guard mankind effectively and permanently against the potential misuse of atomic energy in the form of the atomic bomb? Their treacherous use in the future by a small but unscrupulous state might even wreck a civilization. Scientists may find means to render this impossible, but at present they possess no such remedy. Politicians, on the other hand, hope by means of treaties and covenants, national and international, to exclude the atomic bomb from use in warfare. Swift, terrible and absolutely inevitable penalties would have to be enforced if any combatant dared to use the atomic bomb in warfare; but every historian is aware that a desperate foe will resort to any device, however dangerous, if it should seem to promise the slightest chance of success. As for the effectiveness of covenants, that depends upon the moral standards of those who have entered into them. Solemn assurances are worth nothing if they are given by knaves. Mr. Gladstone's protest to the Russian bear in *Punch's* cartoon: '*But you promised you would not,*' and the bear's retort: '*But why did you believe me when I promised?*' describes the situation only too likely to recur where honourable states make treaties with dishonourable states.

Bertrand Russell in his broadcast talk dealt with the real cause of the peril created by the atomic bomb. It is due to science having made much more rapid advances than morality. But how is this situation to be remedied? It is hoped that international education, international culture, will develop a consciousness of international friendship and international responsibility which if it does not

eliminate warfare will at least render the use of the atomic bomb impossible, and impossible also the use of biological warfare, something even more terrible than the atom bomb to which Sir John Anderson referred in his broadcast. Students of modern civilization are hardly likely to feel any strong sense of security as a result of these international methods. UNO seems as little able to guarantee mankind against warfare and its barbarities as did its promising predecessor, the League of Nations. It is more morality that mankind needs. Bertrand Russell is right there, but it is not culture but religion that can effectively help mankind in this desperate situation. Here Bertrand Russell will disagree. Some years ago he declared that religion was the dragon which guarded the gate by which mankind could enter into the golden age. Did he take this view because he did not realize how dependent morality is upon religion? The present failure of morality to develop, which Bertrand Russell deplores, is primarily due to the failure of religion to develop. It is not the abolition of religion which is going to open the gate of the golden age to humanity, but the development of the right kind of religion. Moral forces are dependent ultimately upon spiritual forces. Our modern democracy if it is to reach high moral levels needs to unite its democracy to theocracy. It needs to subordinate the Will of the People to the Will of God. Covenants within the framework of UNO or the League of Nations are desirable and needful, but the worth of these covenants depends upon mankind's conscious loyalty to its God. The Bible—the book of the two covenants* with God, old and new—makes abundantly clear the terms of the divine covenant. Within the framework of that covenant all that mankind needs for peace, prosperity and progress is available. Without that covenant a dreary and disastrous destiny faces a doomed race.

It was this which was expressed towards the close of his life by J.A. Spender, the great editor of the *Westminster Gazette*. He said in 1942:

> 'We have got to get back to God . . . unless the world gets back to God, it hasn't a chance . . . We ought to *hurry* back to God.'

What is Essential Christianity?

It is charged against Modernists that they are much more concerned with discovering the essentials of the Christian religion than with upholding the dogmas, institutions, and practice of the Catholic Church. This charge is half true, for the Modernist is convinced that there are large numbers of intelligent people out-

* The Hebrew *bĕrith* means a covenant, not a Testament—this latter is a misleading translation.

side the Church to-day who will never accept Christianity unless the Christian religion be presented to them in its essential form. At present they cannot see the wood for the trees. The following, entitled *Essential Christianity*, by William E. Wilson, B.D., of which we publish the core here, has elicited wide appreciation.

'Attempts to state what is essential Christianity, or to indicate "the simple core of the Gospel," generally fail by saying too much. Three short sentences are sufficient to indicate the essence of Christianity — I do not say "to express it," for its expression can only be given in life. These three sentences are:

1. *God, the Creator of all things, gives Himself to men in Jesus Christ.*
2. *The one and only necessary response to that gift is that each man accept it by giving himself to God.*
3. *There results from that acceptance by self-giving a life guided and empowered by God.*

'A Christian is not simply one who believes these statements to be true, but one who acts upon them; who does give himself to God, and in whom therefore the result, a life lived in God's guidance and power, begins. . . .

'When men make this response to God in Christ their whole lives, their emotions, thoughts and acts, and their relations with other people begin to be changed immensely for the better. . . .

'This experience of God, reached through Christ, is the same in all ages and all nations. It depends neither on education, temperament — mystical or other — degree of civilization or individual endowment. It is found in the highly educated and in the ignorant. In every age, race and class it is discernibly the same, and always consists in growing likeness to Christ. . . .

'The great stress laid upon secondary things by most sections of the Christian Church has tended to prevent many from even seeing that this response to God is really the essence of the Christian faith. Creeds, sacraments, the right method of conducting divine service, the orders of the ministry, theories of Atonement, belief in original sin—a vast amount of ecclesiastical and theological accretions, some valuable in their right place, some questionable — have been emphasized as of essential importance, and thus the really essential thing has become hidden. . . .

'This recognition of the true essence of Christianity has a direct bearing on the problem of Christian unity. For the divisions of Christianity, now so widely deplored, arose almost without exception from over-emphasis on secondary matters, and neglect of this central thing. . . .

'The need then for us to-day is ourselves to regain the God-guided and God-empowered life by surrender to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. . . .'

Some perhaps might prefer something more brief, such, for nstance, as is expressed in J. S. Mill's familiar phrase: 'So to ive that Christ would approve our life.' Others might prefer St. ohn's declaration: 'God is Love, and everyone that loveth is orn of God and knoweth God.' Others might prefer the Lord's rief command: 'Follow thou Me.' All these definitions or descriptions of essential Christianity are agreed on one point, that practice must be united with faith. There can be no essential

Christianity without that combination. In Illingworth's memorable words :

> 'The Christian religion refuses to be proved first and practised afterwards. Its practice and its proof go hand in hand.'

What Church he who accepts essential Christianity should enter must depend upon personal and local circumstances and the answer which the individual must give to the larger question : Which of these competing Christian denominations promises to be most effective for the future advancement of the Kingdom of God among mankind?

New Methods of Matrimonial Reconciliation

The following item from the Australian *Church of England News Bulletin* is of interest :

> 'The Dean-designate of Sydney (Dr. Barton Babbage), who is to be installed by the Archbishop (Dr. Mowll) early in March, has decided to establish a matrimonial reconciliation clinic at the Cathedral, with the help of an advisory panel of doctors, pyschiatrists and a lawyer.
>
> 'Four years ago the precentor of the cathedral (the Rev. G. L. Oliver), who is a trained psychologist, instituted a series of talks on the problems of married life. Since then many people have come to him for advice. Already there is a clinic at the cathedral to help children of unhappy marriages.
>
> 'Other Church bodies in Sydney doing good work in matrimonial conciliation are the Mothers' Union, which has a clinic in its rooms, the Home Mission Society, and the Christian Social Order Movement, which has achieved much success through a panel of medical advisers.'

This ministry of matrimonial reconciliation seems likely to do more to foster the realization of the Christian ideal of marriage as a monogamous life union than ecclesiastical declarations that those who have divorced their partners on the grounds of adultery and malicious desertion will incur the Church's censure should they marry again whilst the divorced and guilty partner is still living. If they who marry again under such circumstances are, as Dr. Johnson might have pronounced, examples of the triumph of hope over experience, at least in the light of declarations attributed to Jesus in St. Matthew's Gospel (*Mt.* v, 31 ; xix, 9) they can hardly be pronounced to be non-Christian or anti-Christian. Until the Church of England possesses the moral courage to affirm that the innocent partner in a divorce can rightly claim to have his second marriage solemnized by the Church even though the divorced partner be still living, we shall have the prevailing public opinion perpetuated that the Church in acting thus is as lacking in the spirit of English justice as of Christian sympathy. The presence of medical practitioners, psychiatrists, lawyers on these Christian agencies of matrimonial reconciliation is extremely desirable and

nay do much to develop methods which will not only mend broken nomes but educate the community in right methods of preparation or marriage.

ST. PETER AND THE POPES

Time (Chicago) of January 27th makes the following startling announcement — startling at least to those who hold the view that he Roman Church never changes :

> 'The Roman Catholic Church this week officially abolished six popes. It was mainly the work of 77-year-old Monsignor Angelo Mercati, Prefect of the Vatican Archives, who began looking into the papal roster during the reign of the present Pontiff's predecessor, Pius XI. Two centuries ago, Giovanni Marangoni, custodian of the Roman catacombs, made up a list of popes based largely on a series of dated papal portraits on the walls of the famed Roman church, St. Paul's Outside the Walls. Scholars had known that the old list was inaccurate, but it took Monsignor Mercati's diligent digging to discover how inaccurate it was. This week the new Vatican Directory reported the revised list. Highlights :
>
> '¶ Six popes had to be dropped ; one (Donus II) never existed ; two (the supposed third & fifth Popes Cletus and Anacletus) were the same man. But three new popes had been found : Boniface VI (for a few days in 896), and possibly, Dioscorus (for 22 days in 530) and Leo VIII (from 963 to 965). In the case of no fewer than 74 popes, changes had to be made in such matters as their names and dates.
>
> '¶ Thirty-seven anti-popes are listed, the first of whom—Hippolytus of the 3rd Century—is still considered a saint. From four legitimate pontiffs the designation of sainthood was removed.
>
> 'Because of sketchy records and the questionable validity of some papal elections, Pius XII will probably never know whether he is the 256th successor to St. Peter or the 260th — or somewhere in between.'

But the crucial question is not whether the present Pope is the 256th or the 260th successor of St. Peter but whether he is the successor of St. Peter at all. The traditional Roman Catholic belief is that St. Peter was the founder of the Church of Rome and that the long line of popes or monarchical bishops originated from him. No one knew better than the greatest of modern Roman Catholic church historians, Duchesne, what tremendous difficulties faced this theory.

First, there is no convincing historical evidence that St. Peter was the founder of the Roman Church or that he consecrated any successor in the monarchical episcopate of that Church and that his line of monarchical bishops has continued in unbroken and undoubted succession from St. Peter thenceforward. The case for St. Peter being the Founder of the Church of Jerusalem and also the Founder of the Church of Antioch is much stronger than for his being the Founder of the Church of Rome. Historical evidence proves convincingly that there was a flourishing Christian Church in Rome before St. Paul wrote his *Epistle to the Romans*

about 55 A.D., and that it was not until some years later that St. Paul visited Rome when he was brought there as a Roman prisoner. There is no evidence at all that St. Peter visited Rome before St. Paul wrote the *Epistle to the Romans*, but good evidence that he visited Rome at a later period and in the lifetime of St. Paul, and that both apostles were martyred at Rome and their bodies buried there in the Neronian persecution about 65 A.D. They were not, therefore, founders of the Church of Rome and there is no extant evidence that they organized it, but that they did much to strengthen and inspire that Church we can have no doubt. Whether either of the apostles or both of them had a monarchical episcopal successor in the Church of Rome is a matter of the greatest doubt. It is true that lists of these monarchical successors came into existence, the earliest in the second half of the second century, but they are not in complete agreement and are therefore suspected of being faked. The historian, Viscount Bryce, writes of the early bishops of Rome:

> 'The dates of the bishops of this early period cannot be fixed with certainty, the traditions about them being contradictory. . . .'

The absence of distinct early records of the early Roman bishops is further shown by the fact that both the Liberian and Felician Catalogues place Anicetus between Hyginus and Pius.

All the historical evidence which survives indicates that during the fifty years which followed on the martyrdom of St. Paul and St. Peter in 65 A.D. the Church of Rome was not ruled by a monarchical episcopate at all, but by a collegiate episcopate or collegiate presbyterate. In this primitive period the terms *presbyter* and *episcopus* were interchangeable, and designated men holding precisely the same office in the governing committee of the local church. There was a subordinate committee in the organization of these local churches which consisted of deacons (usually seven). Only gradually was the monarchical episcopate, with which we are all acquainted to-day, developed out of this primitive collegiate episcopate. During the fifty years after St. Peter's death all the evidence, except the dubious episcopal lists compiled at a later period, proves that the Church of Rome was governed and administered by presbyters and deacons, not by a monarchical bishop. This can be seen by references to such literature as *The Epistle of Clement of Rome*, 96 A.D., *Clement II*, an ancient homily, *The Pastor of Hermas*, *The Epistle of St. Ignatius to the Romans* and *I Peter*, written from Rome itself, in which St. Peter speaks of himself as the fellow-presbyter of the presbyters he is addressing. Hence the learned Duchesne has dared to conclude his investigation of this difficult problem with this verdict:

'The Church of God which "dwells in Rome" may have inherited the supreme authority of its apostolic founders in a diffused form.' (*Early History of the Church*, Vol. I, p. 70).

If this be the case, obviously the episcopal lists of Roman Popes for this early period constitute the conjectures of a later age and not reliable historical facts. Certain consequences which invalidate the Petrine claims of the Papacy ensue from this conclusion, but we have no space to discuss them here. It is these Petrine claims which demand further investigation and elucidation by truth-loving Roman Catholic historians.

Clericalist Escapism

An influential young clergyman working in a large parish writes to us as follows:

'There is a sort of Retractarian Movement going on in England, it seems to me: a desire to narrow things down, to unchurch, to transfer from the clergy to the people the blame for the existing situation. Archbishop Temple's address to the Church Army in St. Paul's three or four years ago, in which he said that the duty of the clergyman was in church, to train the faithful few to evangelize the outside many, just horrified me. The faithful few can look after themselves and in any case are not the stuff of which evangelists are made.'

Evidence has just come to hand that this exclusive disciplinarian policy has already secured a footing in the Anglican communion in Australia. *The Australian Church of England News Bulletin* (March 3rd, 1947) under the heading 'Shall the Church refuse its Rites?' publishes the following statement:

'A committee of clergy appointed at the last conference of clergy of the diocese of Brisbane to consider Church discipline has circulated a report for consideration at the next conference. The report recommends (1) that baptism be refused a child neither of whose parents is a regular worshipper; (2) that the rite of Holy Matrimony be refused where neither party is fulfilling the duty of worship; (3) that it is a farce, and not a charity, to read the burial office over one who has persistently separated himself from the fellowship of the Church and to refer to him as "our dear brother here departed."

'The report says that Communion three times a year, including Easter, should be the minimum test of duty of a Church member. It has not had a favourable reception in the other dioceses of the Commonwealth. Its critics suggest that while its underlying desire to achieve reality of Churchmanship is unexceptionable, that objective is more likely to be attained by charitableness and instruction than by so harsh a discipline as is advocated, and that the desire for the ministrations of the Church at baptism, holy matrimony, and burial presents priceless opportunities of Christian influence and instruction.'

We heartily concur with these comments on the Brisbane policy and hope that the English bishops in whose dioceses this movement has been initiated, and not, we fear, without episcopal

support, will reconsider their attitude. It is surely only a young fanatic or a frustrated pessimist who could adopt such a policy in an ordinary English community. We do not deny that in the foreign mission field such rigid disciplinarian methods may be needful, but in an ordinary English parish, especially a rural one, such methods play the ball into the hands of all who are opposed to the Church of England.

Broadsheets and Narrow Policies

A group of young Anglo-Catholic clergy in Hull and its vicinity issued early in this year a public manifesto entitled the *Broadsheet*. It draws a dismal picture of the condition of the Church in this land; it blames the Church authorities and complains that those who attempt to carry out reforms in which the group believes would of necessity come into conflict with the authorities and be charged with disloyalty. The *Broadsheet* fails however to state clearly what these desirable reforms are. Readers of the manifesto, who are naturally in sympathy with the young and earnest, are as a consequence puzzled about the real nature of the reforms desired. This would appear to be the reaction which the *Broadsheet* has produced on Dr. Woods, Bishop of Lichfield.

He finds the required reforms in the faithful, attractive, patient, hopeful discharge of their pastoral duties by the parochial clergy. This, of course, is excellent advice, whether given by a bishop or by a churchwarden, but is it enough? The *Broadsheet* zealots are really out, if we are not mistaken, to catholicize parochial church life by the exercise of rigid church discipline. The zealots believe that the Roman Church in this country owes its influence to its unflinching exercise of church discipline. We doubt if these would-be reformers really understand the Roman methods. Whilst externally rigid, internally there is no Church more flexible than the Church of Rome. Whilst unflinching in its assertion of its spiritual authority, there is no Church which in practical matters is more ready to make shrewd compromises. But our Hull reformers ought to know that the Church of England is not the Church of Rome, and that methods which are successful in the Roman Church will almost invariably prove to be a failure if introduced into the Church of England.

Roger Ascham wrote in his *Schoolmaster*:

> 'To have written this in Latin or in Greek had been easier, but I have written English things in the English tongue for Englishmen.'

This is the problem which faces the Church to-day in its task of evangelization. It has got to adjust the English Church to the intellectual, moral and spiritual needs of the English people.

Although this wants doing, and doing as quickly as can be managed, it is undoubtedly a very long and difficult task because it is mainly an educational task and demands the exercise of many-sided influences if it is to develop such a spirit of love and loyalty for the English Church as exists for the English Crown. Such a spirit is latent in the English breast both at home and in the Dominions beyond the seas and responds readily to the right kind of appeal. The problem here presented is intensely practical and its method of solution will be different, for instance, in the foreign mission field among new converts from what it ought to be in an English parish. Not *semper eadem* but 'vary the length of the bowling' is the English method and is most effective in an English environment.

The uncompromising spirit developing in certain clerical circles to-day which advocates the rigid enforcement of regulations is as unwise as it is un-Christian. It is unwise because any attempt in religion to force English people creates a spirit not simply of opposition but of resentment. Archbishop Laud's policy of 'Thorough,' which cost him his head, created the Puritan policy of 'Root and Branch' aimed at the suppression of all prelacy. The policy is un-Christian. St. Paul, who never lacked moral courage, wrote of his evangelistic method: 'I am become all things to all men if by any means I may save some.'

Adaptation of means to ends is the Christian method of evangelization.

The Poverty of the Clergy and its Remedy

The increasing poverty of the clergy is securing much publicity in our English press. This clerical poverty is the lot mainly of married curates and the incumbents of the poorer parishes.

Palmerston's jibe that it was not his business to preach apostolic poverty on an income of £10,000 a year applies, of course, to no clergyman to-day, not even to the Primates of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of London, Winchester and Durham. Income tax and rates have reduced the actual incomes of our better-paid clergy in a most alarming manner. This Franciscan discipline, however, the clergy share in common with their wealthier brethren of the laity. England has become a poor country, and there are few indeed among the wealthier classes who do not find the greatest difficulty in making both ends meet to-day.

The Church authorities have not been behindhand in attempting to remedy the situation by methods sound and unsound. The temporary union of small benefices seems to us to be sound; re-

strictions imposed upon the marriage of curates seems to us to be unsound. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners and Q.A.B. have earned the admiration and gratitude of all who know their achievements during the last hundred years by their judicious management of the Church's financial resources within their charge. But the abolition of tithe and mining royalties and the imminent nationalization of railways are beyond their powers to deal with. The nation's representatives have deprived the Church of sources of income for which, it must be confessed, the nation has paid less than the commercial value of that which it has taken. The Church authorities, rightly as we think, have not protested, but as the impoverishment of the clergy threatens to be further increased by the reduction of the value of Church endowments, they are justified at least in pointing out to the English public the effect of this policy and in asking for financial assistance to counteract it. We doubt very much, however, whether their appeals are likely to secure the remedy they desire. We believe that it is only a change in Church policy in a number of ways, in which the Church is unwilling to change, that the remedy will be found.

If the ministrations and services of the clergy were valued by the majority of their parishioners there would be no difficulty in securing for such clergymen adequate stipends. In the British Dominions the stipends of the clergy are, with the rarest exception, contributed by their laity in the form of church collections, Easter offerings, and the annual subscriptions of wealthier parishioners. The bishoprics are endowed, and in a few cases the cathedral stalls, but the existence of any form of parochial endowment is rare indeed. George Augustus Selwyn, one of the ablest of colonial Church administrators, thought that the ideal to be aimed at for the support of the parochial clergy was that half the incumbent's income should be derived from parochial endowments and the other half from parochial offerings. If the whole of the incumbent's stipend be derived from endowments the parishioners are at the mercy of the incumbent; if the whole of the incumbent's stipend be derived from voluntary offerings the incumbent is placed at the mercy of his parishioners. And no doubt the Bishop, like the late Lord Acton, knew enough of human nature to realise that power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Bishop Selwyn's policy of making the parishioners responsible for some portion of the maintenance of their clergy is thoroughly sound, but it demands that the parishioners shall possess a dominant share in the selection of their pastor. Patronage reform must be united to any sound policy for the improvement of clerical incomes —there's the rub. Neither the bishops nor the parochial patrons

are willing to surrender their rights to the parishioners. If, however, the parish pastor were appointed by a patronage board which consisted of four members, two appointed by the parish, one by the patron, one by the diocese, and if the bishop must appoint the candidate selected by at least three of the committee or give his reasons for refusal in writing to the candidate, we believe that this new method would prove generally acceptable — the Archdeacon in each case in conference with the parishioners settling the share which the parishioners should contribute to the parson's stipend. This would prove to be, as it developed, a much better method of dealing with clerical poverty than the method of episcopal appeals for contributions to a central diocesan fund to be distributed by the bishop and his advisers to poverty-stricken incumbents in parishes with small endowments. The diocesan centralized method ought everywhere to yield place to parochial local methods. This would be in harmony with the essential constitution of the Church of England. For as Professor Watson maintained:

> 'The Church of England is not a combination of dioceses divided into two ecclesiastical provinces but an aggregate of thousands of parishes. Hence "parochialism," not "diocesanism" or "provincialism," must be the method of all church organization which will increase the vigour, vitality, and responsibility of English Church life.'

IN MEMORIAM

GEORGE GORDON COULTON

(1858 — 1947)

On March 4, George Gordon Coulton died, aged 88. His eye was not dim nor his natural force abated nor the keenness and vigour of his mental powers. His death came about as the result of a chill incurred in our Arctic winter.

George Gordon Coulton was essentially a product of the eastern counties, a son of the 'Saxon shore,' a region in which the invaders appear to have extirpated all the native inhabitants. Tall, fair-haired, blue-eyed, lithe and muscular in figure, he was typically Nordic in character, indefatigably energetic, unflinchingly resolute, direct in speech, authoritative in manner. His supreme virtue was his love of truth, and next to that, if it be a virtue, his love of beauty.

He was born in 1858 at King's Lynn, the son of a solicitor in that ancient borough, half seaport, half market-town, with its mediaeval churches and unspoilt merchants' homes. He knew every stone in it, and there is little doubt that this environment

prompted his love of and interest in mediaevalism. His places of education were those of an eastern counties man. His school was Felsted, his university Cambridge (St. Catharine's College). His studies were classical, but an attack of illness deprived him of a good degree. But there was another side to his education, an immensely important one for his future studies. Before going to Felsted he was sent abroad to the *Lycée Imperiale* at St. Omer, and after he left Cambridge he studied in the University of Heidelburg. His mind turned towards the ministry of the Church of England and he became one of 'Vaughan's doves.'

Dr. Vaughan, headmaster of Harrow, after he had been promoted to a deanery, received a number of promising young men into his house, whom he assisted in their preparation for Holy Orders—the best theological college which the Church of England has ever possessed. Many of its members became distinguished ecclesiastics, but Coulton was not among them. Although ordained a deacon, conscientious difficulties prevented his proceeding further in the clerical career. He next took up schoolmastering and was a good schoolmaster, but his real interests were those of a scholar, not those of a pedagogue. His life at this time, and for many years after, was a great struggle, but he remained all the while loyal in his devotion to historical research, and as he possessed literary gifts which enabled him to present the results of his researches in a lucid and arresting manner, he at last achieved a wide reputation and financial stability. Later in life he was elected a Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and a Fellow of the British Academy, and delivered great numbers of courses of lectures both as a university extension lecturer and as a university tutor and professor. He married Miss Rose Ilbert, who became his devoted helper in the incessant drudgery and many-sided interests which such a scholar's life demands.

Coulton's researches were in the field of Western mediaeval life—its religion, its art, its architecture and its literature. Unlike his friend Hastings Rashdall, mediaeval scholasticism was not a main interest. It was the life rather than the thought of the Middle Ages which was his field, and only those who read his volumes can realize how intimate and varied his knowledge of it was. Coulton, although he had abandoned the clerical vocation, was a deeply religious man, utterly devoted to whatsoever things are good, true, pure, lovely in human experience. This religious side of Coulton's nature is expressed most profoundly in one of the least known of his volumes, *Christ, St. Francis, and To-day*. He was a man of strong social sympathies; perhaps his own hard struggle against financial limitations increased his sympathy for those who are not

born with a silver spoon in their mouth. The spirit of the modern Franciscan, which refused to yield to temptations of ease, sloth, materialism, and the 'pride of life' was strongly developed in him. He did not worship poverty nor despise wealth, but he felt the urgent need of eliminating the former and using the latter in the service of man's noblest needs. His stay in Germany when Bismarckian ambitions and Prussian methods were exerting a growing influence on the spirit of that people prophetically inspired him with a sense of danger which must ultimately face our own peace-loving and easy-going nation and even threaten our freedom. He was a clear-headed believer in the motto *si vis pacem para bellum*, and accordingly he espoused the policy of national conscription. He was incapable of comfortably closing his eyes to unpleasant realities and realized that in every sphere of life desirable things must be bought at a price. It was this uncompromising spirit combined with his love of truth which led him into exacting controversies with Roman Catholic apologists whom he detected falsifying historic truth in the interests of religious propaganda. His *bête noir* was Cardinal Gasquet. He criticized the Cardinal fiercely, and the Cardinal instead of retracting or defending his statements remained silent. This created the very worst impression in Coulton's mind, and thenceforward he never spared Roman Catholic apologetic statements and pious traditions which were unable to face historical criticism. The claim that the mediaeval monks had planned and built their exquisitely beautiful buildings Coulton maintained was without foundation. These buildings were the achievements of guilds of stonemasons. No doubt the ecclesiastics selected the designs, but they did not create them nor do the work which carrying them out entailed. Out of their vast ecclesiastical endowments they paid the designers and craftsmen. As a result of this controversial side of Coulton's life he became known as the *malleus Romanorum*. Some accounted it a pity that he should have spent so much of his energy in controversy, but be that as it may, his contribution to non-controversial exposition of mediaeval religion, art, and literature far exceeds in quantity his controversial writings. His *magnum opus*, *Five Centuries of Religion*, is not likely to be surpassed.

Dr. Coulton was a Vice-President of the Modern Churchmen's Union and will be greatly missed as one who by his splendid contributions to sound learning and exacting scholarship enriched the life of a religious communion which he loved as he did all things English, although in some cases desirous of making them more worthy of their great traditions and potentialities.

H.D.A.M.

NEW LIGHT ON THE NATURE OF MAN

By G. N. M. Tyrrell, President of the Society for Psychical Research

A BROADCAST by an Oxford Professor of Philosophy on the Implications of Telepathy, such as was given by Professor H. H. Price on February 2nd, 1947, is a sign that the importance of this subject is being more widely recognized. Not only is telepathy, as Professor Price maintained, highly significant for philosophy; it is significant also for the body-mind problem and for our whole conception of the nature of man.

The *Modern Churchman* for December, 1943, contained articles on both these subjects, the first, on 'The Nature of Man,' by the Bishop of Truro, and the second on 'The Body-Mind and Immortality,' by the Rev. J. C. Hardwick. In the latter article it was pointed out that there is evidence that scientific research, pushed far enough, does not endorse the current materialistic view of the body-mind relation. Sir Charles Sherrington, after fifty years' study of the brain, came to reject the orthodox view of epiphenomenalism and admitted that the 'how' of the liaison between mind and brain 'remains for science, as for philosophy, a riddle.' The author also referred to the argument, so frequently used and so easily exposed, that mind, because in our experience it is always found to be united with a physical organism, must therefore be causally dependent on the latter. The answer is that by means of our senses we can only perceive matter; therefore we can only become aware of mind indirectly by its effects on matter. That we never perceive mind alone proves nothing either way, except that our normal means of acquiring information are limited. Hence, as Mr. Hardwick says, 'We are indeed here in the region of speculation.' It must not be forgotten, however, that we do possess certain further evidence bearing on the body-mind problem which is too often left out of account. Professor Price, in his broadcast on telepathy, not only accepted the evidence for it as completely convincing, but pointed out an interesting reason for its great theoretical importance. Primarily, it is because telepathy, a human function, occurs outside consciousness and only becomes known to consciousness by indirect and rather peculiar means. Telepathy, the fundamental process, occurs in that region of the personality which the modern psychologist calls the 'unconscious'; thereby extending the body-mind problem beyond the

relation of normal consciousness to the body. There is a wider range of consciousness to be taken into account as well.

Telepathy is a process of which the experient is directly unconscious. Its *modus operandi* is not unlike that of the Freudian dream, for the material emerges indirectly by means of an *ad hoc* creation of a psychological kind, which is often symbolical; so that a thought in another mind is not known directly by a means analogous to sense-perception, but indirectly by a psychologically constructed intermediary. The psychological machinery involved is normal and possessed by all, and it often brings to consciousness other things besides telepathy: a dream, for example, can be in part telepathic and in part of an ordinary psychological type; and symbolism can play a part in both. This shows us that we have no right to separate telepathy from other processes originating in the 'unconscious.' We call it 'supernormal' or 'paranormal' only because it has features which particularly surprise us.

The principle used to bring telepathic information to consciousness is that of *mediation*: a secondary construction is created to represent a primary event. This, indeed, is the principle by which we are bound to acquire knowledge of independent reality when we have no sense-organs specially adapted for the purpose. But it is a loose and irregular way, and that is why telepathy, and indeed other 'paranormal' phenomena as well, are often confused and unreliable.

Besides the clear evidence for telepathy, there is more, both observational and experimental, which supports the view that precognition, or non-inferential knowledge of future events, is a fact. This, too, originates in the 'unconscious' or, as F. W. H. Myers preferred to call it, the 'subliminal self.' The therapeutic psychologist, whose aim is practical rather than exploratory, is apt to take a somewhat narrow view of the 'unconscious,' confining himself to that portion of its content which interests him. But telepathy and foreknowledge invite a much more comprehensive view. As Myers said: 'Hidden in the deep of our being is a rubbish-heap as well as a treasure-house,' and he regarded the treasure-house as extending to supra- as well as to infra-conscious levels of the self.

A fact of primary importance about telepathy is that it acts *vertically*, dipping down into the self instead of extending horizontally into the external world, as do the normal senses. Yet the fact that it corresponds with events which are in someone else's mind, and hence, as commonly supposed, independent of the percipient, shows that it is not a merely subjective phenomenon. In a loose, though not in a strictly philosophical sense, telepathy is a

cognitive process. This is perhaps the first piece of clear evidence which we, in the West, have discovered by Western methods, supporting the immemorial belief of the East that introspection, no less than extroverted sense-perception, brings us into touch with reality.

Telepathy and foreknowledge point to an order of events very different from anything which exists in the sensible world: they point to a large extension of the self, where before we had assumed that the self was exclusively identical with the conscious phase of our being. This is a difficult idea to grasp. The so-called 'unconscious' need not be *intrinsically* unconscious. Though apparently other, it need not be in reality alien. The self extends on both sides of the boundary; and normal consciousness is in reality an *abstraction* from the total self, contrived by nature for biological reasons in order that mind may function in a material world. The possibility clearly presented — and this should be of great interest for religion — is that when the physical body dies, the artificial barrier between the normal self and the upper reaches of the subliminal self may vanish.

It is true that telepathy, and the phenomena called 'paranormal,' give only fitful glimpses of what goes on outside normal consciousness: there is a fuzziness and a commingling of things from different sources and much use of symbolism, all of which is repellent to the clear intellect. Many people ignore the evidence for the paranormal, not because it is weak, but because it is so elusive and difficult to attack by any of the recognized methods of scientific research. But if we turn away from things strange and exotic, merely because they *are* exotic, we miss, as modern scientific research indicates, our best chances of enlightenment.

Besides, we have to remember that telepathy and foreknowledge do not stand as queer abnormalities in complete isolation. Both as regards their source and their mode of reaching consciousness they are integrally associated with inspiration. From the same region where telepathy occurs come the promptings of genius and, in the higher levels, the experiences of religious mysticism. Most of the great original work performed by man has come from a source beyond consciousness. This may sometimes be obscured by the fact that consciousness has to work hard in order to give the inspiration its expression. Skill, thought and inspiration blend together; and only when all three are of the highest quality does a work of genius result. The extra-conscious origin of much of the best work in literature has been confessed by its authors. R. L. Stevenson, who attributed his literary work to his 'Brownies,' said that they did it for him while he sat at ease, a spectator in the

talls. It is astonishing how many eminent writers, artists, poets, nd composers, if their biographical statements are sought out, are ound to have testified to this sort of thing. Miss Rosamund Harding, in her excellent little book *An Anatomy of Inspiration*, as listed numbers of cases. Goethe, speaking of his poems, said: 'The songs made me, not I them.' Dickens confessed that when e sat down to write 'some beneficent power' showed it all to him. Vordsworth hammered at a passage in vain when inspiration was ithdrawn. The testimony all along is that inspiration from an xtra-conscious source lies at the root of all originality. Tchaikovky declared that if the condition of intense inspiration were to ast long, 'no artist could survive it.' It is very interesting, too, rom the point of view of time-transcendence, to remember that Mozart said, 'Nor do I hear in my imagination the parts *successively*, but I hear them, as it were, all at once.' The essence of enius is evidently not an 'infinite capacity for taking pains' but receptivity to extra-conscious inspiration, coupled with superlave powers of expression.

Religious mysticism does not stand entirely apart from artistic nspiration, or even from such paranormal phenomena as telepathy. The extra-conscious source, in its varying gradations, is common o all. Perhaps the best way to put it is to say that things beyond onsciousness, however intrinsically different from one another, ave to come through the same bottle-neck in order to reach the onscious mind. The narrow passage across the boundary may be egarded, as psycho-analysts put it, as being guarded by a censor; ut when we come to the advanced mystic, the censorship is reaxed, the channel widens, and supra- and normal consciousness egin to blend. Experience becomes transcendental, and the mited abstraction we call 'ourself' begins to be gathered into ne whole. There is universal testimony that this occurs. From Dionysius to Ignatius; from Teresa to Boehme in the West—the *ufis* in the East; the records of the Upanishads, the teaching of ne *Bhagavad Gita*—the testimony is always the same; reality in s completeness lies beyond the scope of normal consciousness. That which reaches us through our senses is specialized knowedge, limited and provincial.

It is surely strange that when the body-mind problem and the ature of man are being discussed, these things are commonly left ut of account. More than ever it is strange that they should be eft out of account in discussions of religion; for it is precisely the elf-transcendent self which gives meaning to the injunction that ne must lose one's life in order to save it, and that we must disegard the interests of the normally conscious self in order to

promote those of the true self. If the self is merely an atomic consciousness, what do these things mean? According to the testimony of all religious experience, it is through the larger self alone that we are able to make contact with God.

No doubt the apparent otherness of the self beyond the threshold of consciousness is a difficulty. Can we have identity with something which appears to be other than ourselves? The idea that we can is repellent to minds accustomed to thinking in terms of the clear-cut separations of the material world. The mystery of the human personality is bound up with the problem of the One and the Many. The idea that what seems not ourself can at the same time be our very self is an intellectual paradox. The mind which thinks normally conscious thoughts regards itself as autonomous, and not as an abstraction from a larger self. The deeper we go, the more difficult does the distinction between subjective and objective become. Evidently we cannot hope for a cut-and-dried solution of the body-mind problem, or a satisfactory conception of the nature of man, in terms clearly conceived by the intellect alone. Realization concerning these difficult problems must grow gradually and intuitively by assimilating all that bears on the subject.

Telepathy and foreknowledge merely emphasize a fact which has been gradually coming to light for some time, that problems of life and mind cannot be fully dealt with by the impersonal methods of science, which employ concepts common to all and a type of intellectual process which has been developed to deal primarily with causal sequences in a space-time world. Physiology can deal with the body as a machine but not as a living organism whose secret lies in the principle of 'holism.' Psychology can apply the methods of the laboratory to mental processes which are closely related to bodily movements; but it cannot in this way investigate the 'unconscious.' Psychical research takes us a step further in this direction because it reveals more startling truths, further removed from what we call the 'normal.' We cannot get to the bottom of these while restricting ourselves to ideas which are listed in the dictionary and processes of thought which are common property. New types of fact demand new ideas, and deeper penetration involves heightened awareness and what is called 'inspiration.' The inspired genius and the contemplative are here in the van of progress. It may not be possible for more than a few to follow them. The important thing for most of us is to realize that this is the case and so to get our perspective right. The kind of thinking that is public and neutral to all is in reality confined within a limited area, and our perspective is wrong if we believe its scope to be universal.

It is interesting that the Bishop of Truro, in the article I have referred to, does make a passing reference to telepathy (p. 207); but he leaves the subject at once without remarking on its significance. Nor does Mr. Hardwick bring the subject to bear on his consideration of the body-mind relation. Yet, without a recognition of that portion of the self in which telepathy originates, our whole perspective of Man and his body-mind is wrong. The centre of gravity of the human being is in the wrong place: the part has been mistaken for the whole. Seen in the wrong perspective, mind appears to be body-dependent. As William James has pointed out in his essay on 'Human Immortality' (Ingersoll Lecture, 1897-8), the orthodox view of science is that the brain is *productive* of consciousness, whereas there is much more to be said for the view that it is *transmissive* of it. We should, perhaps, regard mind as having overcome an extremely difficult task in organizing matter as its temporary dwelling-place. It is really the acquisition of a right perspective which counts most, not only for religion but also for a right understanding of the human being, and hence of all those problems which constitute the human situation.

THE REMARRIAGE OF THE DIVORCED: THE RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF PARISH PRIESTS

By the Rev. G. L. H. Harvey, Editor of *The Church and the Twentieth Century*

TIME was when 'Life and Liberty' were blessed words in ecclesiastical circles. The movement which thought to have found in them an open sesame to future progress and adopted them as its battle cry advanced from victory to victory; its leader became successively Archbishop of York and Archbishop of Canterbury. And yet, according to many observers, the fruits of victory are shrivelled and unappetizing. The much publicized Report, *The Conversion of England*, does not suggest that the influence of the Church of England on the life of the nation has deepened or broadened. 'There can be no doubt,' it states, 'that there is a wide and deep gulf between the Church and the people.' It refers to 'the present irrelevance of the Church in the life and thought of the community in general.' Happily there is reason to suspect that the diagnosis of the situation in the Report is alto-

gether too superficial. But, however this may be, it is certain that the gulf between Church and people will be widened and deepened if the Church attempts to impose on its adherents a harsh and narrow discipline inconsistent with the enlightened moral judgment of our own time and alien from the moral judgment of many of the greatest and most representative moral theologians of its past. Such an attempt is now being made in the sphere of marriage and divorce.

Liberty, comprehensiveness, and a wide toleration have been marks of our National Church. This is no accident. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has saved each of the great parties in the Church at various times from exclusion. The individual clergyman has also enjoyed a liberty of action and opinion which he would soon lose if the Church became an entirely self-governing sect or denomination. He is, for example, invested with a grave personal responsibility in the matter of the remarriage of divorced persons, a responsibility which necessarily involves a freedom of decision. A determined attempt is being made to remove his responsibility and to destroy his liberty of action.

In the name of true Life and true Liberty it is incumbent on every member of the Church of England to resist this ecclesiastical aggression.

Until the passage of the *Matrimonial Causes Act* of 1937, commonly called the Herbert Act, a clergyman was under a legal obligation to solemnize the remarriage of a parishioner who had been the successful petitioner in a divorce suit and wished to marry in church. He was under no such compulsion in the case of the defendant. This obligation was laid on him by the *Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act* of 1857, which simplified and democratized the previous cumbersome and very expensive procedure for obtaining a divorce, and established the Divorce Court.

It is simply not true that this Divorce Act was imposed on an unwilling Church by a tyrannical State. It was supported in the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury, by a future Archbishop, A. C. Tait, then Bishop of London, and by eight other bishops, a majority of the bishops voting for the Second Reading. Further reflection confirmed Tait in his conviction that he was right in supporting the Bill.

> 'On full reflection now for many months,' he wrote in his diary, 'I believe this Bill right, and the clergy have gained a far greater concession to their wishes than could have been anticipated in the provision leaving it to their option to celebrate the remarriage of guilty parties or not.'

If Tait was right in thinking that the Act of 1857 treated the clergy with consideration the Herbert Act assuredly treated them

with generosity, for it removed any compulsion of any kind and left them full discretion in the matter of the remarriage of divorced persons.

Now a strange situation has arisen. The bishops, not quite unanimously, but apparently with a considerable measure of unanimity, are attempting to deprive the clergy of the discretion which is their legal right and responsibility. They are, indeed, seeking to ban the solemnization in church of any marriage of a divorced person. The layman has a legal right to marriage in his parish church after a divorce, subject to the proviso that his Vicar is satisfied that his is a suitable case for the religious solemnization of the marriage. The bishops are attempting to deprive him of this right. Incidentally they are depriving the clergy of the privilege of consulting their diocesans in border-line cases. It is most unlikely that immoral irreligious people will desire the religious ceremony; but when there is serious doubt as to whether an application should be granted, the clergyman concerned may well wish to avail himself of the counsel and advice of his bishop. There is no point in doing so if, apart from the merits or demerits of the case in question, the bishop has notoriously made up his mind beforehand.

Significant of the new episcopal policy is a message to his clergy by the Bishop of Liverpool issued in his Diocesan Bulletin of November, 1946. It is in two sections headed respectively *Marriage of Divorced Persons* and *Admission to Holy Communion*. It is convenient first to consider the second section. Here the Bishop contents himself with quoting a Resolution passed by the Upper House of York Convocation. He writes:

> 'The Upper House of the Convocation of York adopted the following: 'Where two persons have contracted a legal marriage during the lifetime of a former partner of either of them and either or both desire to be baptized or to partake of the Holy Communion the curate shall forthwith refer the case to the Bishop of the Diocese, who shall be fully informed of the circumstances.
>
> > '"If and when the Bishop having regard both to the preservation of the Church's witness to the standard of marriage and also to the pastoral care of those who have departed from it, is satisfied that the admission of the person or persons to the Sacraments ought not to give grave offence to the Church, nor would be to the hurt of their own souls he shall direct that they be not excluded therefrom by reason of the marriage so contracted."'

Possibly the Bishop of Liverpool contented himself with quoting a Resolution of the Northern Convocation because his diocese is in the Northern Province. As long ago as 1937 the Upper House of Canterbury Convocation passed a similar Resolution laying it down that, if a divorced person who has remarried desires admis-

sion to Holy Communion, the parish priest should refer the case to his bishop. The bishop then must assure himself (1) that the couple are in conscience persuaded that it is right for them to live together as man and wife, (2) that their admission to Holy Communion

> 'would not give reasonable cause of grave offence to the Church, or to any member thereof who might feel especially aggrieved,'

(3) that it would not be to the hurt of their own souls, (4) that they have habitually resided in the diocese for the past six months, and (5) that they have or have not made a previous application to any other diocesan bishop. When he has done all this the bishop

> 'shall give direction in writing that the person or persons shall not be, or, after such period as he may determine, shall not continue to be repelled from the Sacraments on account of the marriage thus contracted.'

This is indeed to fence the altar, to fence it with a mass of pretentious verbiage which is exposed for what it is in the blunt statement by Bishop Mandell Creighton that

> 'Any form of excommunication is a charge that the person excommunicated is a "notorious evil-liver." Such a charge,' he added, 'can be brought before the cognizance of a civil court; if it cannot be fully proved, it is a libel.'

Probably the person who is wrongly repelled from Holy Communion will be restrained by dislike of notoriety from having recourse to a civil court. Though the offending clergyman may thus feel reasonably safe from being mulcted in damages he is still morally guilty of the grave offence of libel. By his action he is discrediting the Church of which he is an officer, as well as running the risk of alienating from the Church one whose desire to partake of Holy Communion suggests genuine piety.

The Bishop of Liverpool contents himself with quoting a Resolution of the Upper House of York Convocation. He is silent as to its application, though one hesitates to conclude that he regards it as of merely academic interest. Perhaps he assumes that his clergy will be guided by it in practice. But no Resolution by any one of the Houses of Convocation, or by all of them, can alter or modify the position of a clergyman who contemplates excluding from Holy Communion a divorced person who has remarried. The responsibility lies fair and square on his shoulders. *He may not divest himself of it by referring the matter to his bishop, nor may the bishop arrogate to himself a right of decision which does not belong to him.*

This was shown conclusively in the lawsuit *Banister v. Thompson* which, starting in an ecclesiastical court, was carried to the highest court of appeal. Mr. Banister had married in Canada

s deceased wife's sister. His marriage was validated retro-pectively in England by the *Deceased Wife's Sister Act* of 907. He informed his vicar, Canon Thompson, that he proposed o seek admission to Holy Communion. Canon Thompson, after onsulting his bishop, replied that, *acting on the bishop's instruc-ions*, he must refuse him. Mr. and Mrs. Banister thereupon took ction against Canon Thompson in the Court of Arches. It was ain to plead that he had acted on the instructions of his bishop. His was the responsibility, and his alone. He lost his case. The idge in the Court of Arches, Sir Lewis Dibdin, said that he ound it impossible to say that Mr. and Mrs. Banister, lawfully arried according to the law of the land, could by any reasonable se of language be described as 'notorious and open evil-livers' erely because they were living together as man and wife.

Canon Thompson then appealed to the civil court of the King's ench. He lost. Again he appealed to its Appeal Court. Again e lost. Finally he appealed to the House of Lords, there to lose gain by a unanimous decision. From this emerge with un-uestionable clarity the two points that responsibility for exclud-ng from Holy Communion lies exclusively with the parochial ncumbent, and that he is guilty of a grave offence if he purports o exclude any person who in the normal reasonable sense of the ords may not be described as a notorious and open evil-liver.

It is easy to imagine a bishop replying to one of his clergy who as acted on the suggestion of the Convocation Resolution quoted y the Bishop of Liverpool in some such terms as this:

> My dear Vicar,
>
> I have given most careful consideration to the case of Mr. and Mrs. Smith which you have referred to me. My directions are that they be admitted to Holy Communion after the expiration of three calendar months from the date of this letter and that till then you exclude them.

f the bishop were a very scrupulous and conscientious man he ight add a postscript:

> *P.S.* I ought perhaps to remind you that in following my directions you will, as appears from the *Banister v. Thompson* case, be exceeding your legal powers and depriving Mr. and Mrs. Smith of their legal rights. I understand, however, that they are people of modest means, and probably could not afford the expense involved in entering on legal proceedings. I also imagine that they would shrink from the publicity which such a course would bring them. Perhaps I ought to add that, in the remote contingency of action being taken against you in the courts, the *Banister v. Thompson* case to which I have referred shows conclusively that the fact that you have acted under my directions would not constitute a valid defence.

It may be that the Bishop of Liverpool, in quoting the York Convocation Resolution without comment, hopes that bigots and

fanatics who, in defiance of their plain legal and moral obligations, repel decent-living pious people from Holy Communion on the ground that they have married after a divorce action, may be influenced to consult him before proceeding to extremes. If there be such clergy they are by their arbitrary action discrediting the Church and widening the gulf which is alleged to separate the Church from the people.

But we are not concerned primarily with a statement issued by an individual bishop. We only quote the Bishop of Liverpool's message as a convenient illustration of the line taken by the bishops as a body. Under the heading *Marriage of Divorced Persons* he writes :

> 'I am frequently being asked to give consent for the marriage in Church of a person whose former partner is still living; I am assured that the person concerned is the innocent party to Divorce proceedings and that he or she is a regular and faithful member of the Church. While fully sympathizing with the hardness of the case, I am not free to give permission for the marriage to take place in Church. I am bound to uphold the regulations passed by all four Houses of Convocation,
>
> > '"That in order to maintain the principle of lifelong obligation which is inherent in every legally contracted marriage and is expressed in the plainest terms in the marriage service, the Church should not allow the use of that service in the case of anyone who has a former partner still living."
>
> 'It is untrue to the facts of the case to give the impression to the parties that the Bishop has the right to give permission for such a marriage to take place; Bishop and Clergy alike are bound by the laws of duly constituted authority. Having said that let me hasten to add that such cases provide a parish priest with opportunities for pastoral care; every effort should be made to explain the situation to the parties concerned in the most sympathetic way. They have probably gone through great suffering and of all people need the graciousness and understanding which we associate with our Lord. Where such people show signs of true penitence for their share in the wrongs of the past and earnestly desire a fresh start in the presence of God it is permissible for a parish priest to conduct a Service in Church after a Civic Marriage; a special form is available for such a Service and may be obtained at Church House.'

In other words the clergyman must send the parties to the Register Office, though in selected cases he may invite them to a subsequent Service of Matrimonial Benediction. Many people who regard marriage as an essentially religious rite will refuse to go to the Registrar. On grounds which one is bound to respect they will prefer to be married in chapel. The result of the bishops' prescribed procedure is bound to provoke comment and cast some kind of slur on the marriage. The 'principle of lifelong obligation' inherent in marriage is affirmed no less strongly in the *Form of Benediction* than in the Marriage Service. The partners take lifelong vows, and a special benediction on the ring is added.

There seems no reason in principle why the Marriage Service should not be used.

An unpleasant feature of the scheme is the demand that applicants, not, be it noted, for marriage in church, which under any circumstances is regarded as inadmissible, but for the privilege of a Service of Benediction, should 'show signs of true penitence for their share in the wrongs of the past.'

A rather simple-minded but honest and upright man married when on leave during the recent war. For a long period he was without further leave. One day he received from his wife a brutal letter telling him that she was done with him, that she didn't want to hear from him again, and that she was going her own way. He made such enquiries as were possible, and found that she was consorting with other men. Owing to the exigencies of the Service and the tragic accumulation of applications for divorce it was a long time before his case could be heard; but eventually he obtained his freedom. How absurd to demand an expression of penitence from an aggrieved husband in such a case as this.

Normally the clergy know little of Resolutions passed by any or all of the Houses of Convocation. They may or may not notice them in their Church newspaper. The laity know even less. This ignorance and indifference have doubtless been increased of recent years by immersion in the special tasks which the war imposed on clergy and laity alike. The result is that the attempts being made by bishops to implement the various Resolutions on divorce and remarriage bid fair to create considerable confusion. For instance, a Rural Dean, attempting recently to convey to the clergy the instructions of their bishop, stated that he himself would not exclude from Holy Communion a married couple one of whom had divorced a previous partner. In that he showed his wisdom. He added, however, that he would suggest to the couple so married that, as a matter of voluntary discipline, they should refrain from receiving Communion for a period of, say, twelve months. To suggest to people who, in the words of the Canterbury Resolution, 'are in conscience persuaded that it is right for them to live together as man and wife,' to whom it has simply not occurred that they have done anything which ought to exclude them from receiving Holy Communion, that they should voluntarily excommunicate themselves for twelve months is the height of pastoral folly. If they were to react to this injurious suggestion in the way that many would undoubtedly react, a heavy responsibility would lie on the clergyman who was so misguided as to make it. No doubt we shall find that many clergymen, confused by episcopal directions and Convocation Resolutions, in all honesty do many strange and in

result deplorable things. They would be wiser if they were to content themselves with acting in accordance with the law and their own pastoral responsibility. They have now as much personal discretion as they can rightly desire.

Probably not all his brother bishops would use the same kind of language as the Bishop of Liverpool. He tells his clergy that he is *bound* to uphold regulations passed by the four Houses of Convocation. Why? 'Bishop and clergy alike,' he says, 'are bound by the laws of duly constituted authority.' Are the Houses of Convocation then constituted authorities which have the power to make laws? They are not; and only the most ignorant will be misled into imagining that they are. Those Houses of Convocation which have passed Resolutions on the admission to Holy Communion of persons who have married after a divorce have sailed very close to the wind. On the face of it they have come very near to inciting the clergy to break the law; at the best they appear to condone breaches of the law. The Resolution by the four Houses to the effect that the Church should not allow the use of the marriage service in the case of anyone who has a former partner still living is not so grossly disregardful of the law, for the individual clergyman has a legal right to refuse a Church marriage in such cases. But it may with justice be described as thoroughly unconstitutional in that its effect, if it possessed any validity, would be to deprive the clergy of the pastoral discretion which is lawfully theirs.

If the Church of England had always condemned divorce and remarriage after divorce, the Convocations and the bishops might plausibly urge that they were only reaffirming fixed principles which the Church has always held. But this is a matter of history, and in fact it was not so. We have seen that a majority of the bishops in the House of Lords voted in favour of the Second Reading of the Divorce Act of 1857, and that Archbishop Tait considered that Act to be 'right.' That great bishop, Mandell Creighton, who could speak with the highest authority as a historian, said

> 'The question has always troubled the English Church. Cranmer, Andrewes, Laud, alike had no fixed principles.'

As to marriage of a divorced person he was quite definite.

> 'We as Christians abhor divorce; but when a divorce has been judged necessary, are we to refuse any liberty to the innocent and wronged party? It seems to me a matter for our discretion on equitable grounds in each case. I could not advise any of my clergy to refuse to solemnize a marriage of an innocent person who genuinely desired God's blessing.'

This 'discretion on equitable grounds' is now assured to every

ergyman. If he is wise and regardful of the highest interests of e Church of England he will refuse to be browbeaten or intimi- ted by any Resolution of Convocation into surrendering it.

To come down to more recent times, no one could have a onger dislike of second marriages than Archbishop Davidson. et he repudiated the suggestion that a clergyman solemnizing ch a marriage was condoning sin.

> 'It would be difficult to declare it so, when we remember that such men as Bishop Christopher Wordsworth of Lincoln, Bishop Edward King of Lincoln, and Canon William Bright of Christ Church, three of the staunchest Churchmen of the century, though deprecating the marriages as undesirable, believed in and advocated their legitimacy.'

Again, moving back to the seventeenth century a divine so presentative of the High Church section in the Church of Eng- nd as Bishop Cosin was emphatic in affirming that divorce was, ıder some circumstances, legitimate, and that the divorced per- n was free to marry again. He cited Bishop Hall as being of the me opinion.

The utterances of leading and representative Churchmen roughout the centuries negative any contention that the Church England has in the past forbidden divorce or the marriage of vorced persons. Historically it is an untenable proposition. That, doubt, is why the Rigorists take refuge in an alleged Western radition. Resolution 4 in the Majority Report of a Joint Com- ittee of the Convocations of Canterbury and York affirms 'ad- rence to the ancient tradition of the Western Church.' This firmation is not as imposing as it sounds and contains a grave mbiguity. If the tradition is that of pre-Reformation Catholicism, one who knows anything of the trickery, evasion and subterfuge hich were practised in those days will be impressed. The last ing anyone who has the slightest respect for the Church of Eng- nd would wish for it is that it seek for its standards in the sordid nfusion of the principles and practice of mediaeval Catholicism. arriage has been called 'a rational or moral relation.' It belongs the world of ethics and reason, a world very different from that pre-Reformation Catholicism. If the tradition includes that of e centuries which followed the Reformation, we have no right to ave out of account the practice of the reformed Churches, the ore so because they came to birth as separate Churches partly as e result of a strong moral movement. What kind of a Western radition is it which leaves out of account the tradition of our reat sister Church, the Church of Scotland? Assuredly it belongs Western Christendom no less than the Church of Rome or the hurch of England. Had the signatories of the Convocations

Report forgotten that the Church of Scotland is as much an integral part of the Western Church as the Church of England? If so, their outlook is so narrow that their appeal to Western Tradition is invalidated. The Church of Scotland allows divorce for adultery and malicious desertion. It also allows marriage subsequent to divorce.

On analysis the appeal to a Western Tradition boils down to an appeal to pre-Reformation Catholicism or to modern Roman Catholicism. It is notorious that Rome exerts a strong pull on many of the clergy of the Church of England. But happily our Church is still the National Church, and our nation is not well disposed to Roman customs, practice, or *ethos*. Yet in discussion on the marriage question the Roman assumption that marriage is a sacrament keeps appearing. This is not a doctrine of the Church of England. It is an extremely difficult doctrine, and its relevance to the marriage of divorced persons is not too clear seeing that some sacraments are capable of repetition. It is significant, however, that the appeal to this Roman doctrine is frequently made by those same people who appeal to the so-called Western Tradition. When certain Anglicans, with the friendly cognizance of the two Archbishops, took part in conversations with Cardinal Mercier at Malines on possible reunion between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, Archbishop Davidson gave them a very wise bit of parting advice. 'Don't detract from the importance of the XXXIX Articles,' he wrote. The people who talk about marriage as a sacrament seem to have forgotten Article XXV, which includes Matrimony along with Confirmation, Penance, Orders, and extreme Unction as 'commonly called Sacraments' which have 'grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles,' and are partly 'states of life allowed in the Scriptures.' The number of sacraments was not stereotyped in the Roman Church till the Council of Trent, which fixed them at seven, and included Matrimony among them. It, rather amazingly, declared that all the seven had been instituted by Christ. In the minds of the Rigorists has this Roman doctrine that marriage is a sacrament become part of what they are pleased to call the Western Tradition?

To talk about a Western Tradition and the sacramental character of marriage is only to confuse the issue. On the main issue the Liberal is as firm and clear as any Rigorist. He believes that the instinct of monogamy is implanted by God. That is the meaning of the Christian teaching that man and wife are joined together by God. But, holding this principle firmly, he is not prepared to close his eyes to facts. Where he differs from the Rigorist is in his recognition that disloyalty and evil conduct can in fact put asunder

ose whom God has joined together. This is contrary to the ivine intention; but there is much in the world and in the conduct men and women which is contrary to the Divine intention. The ingdom of God has not yet come on earth. In principle marriage indissoluble; in practice it is not. Archbishop Frederick Temple t this point quite plainly in a letter published in his *Memoirs* here he writes that the Church of England does not teach that arriage is indissoluble. It teaches the indissolubility of marriage the case of those whom God hath joined together, but it remem-rs that God separates those who commit adultery. It might be en better to say that, in disobedience to our Lord's precept, men d women by their conduct put asunder those whom God has ined. The Liberals hold that, when this takes place, it is right, se, and humane to deal with an unhappy situation in the best terests of the individual and of society. When a marriage has en wrecked it is neither in the interests of society nor of the indi-dual to make the pretence that it is still intact. It is repugnant the moral and religious sense to speak of the partners as still ined together by God. If the marriage has been smashed by the ong-doing of one of the partners it is mere unctuous Pharisaism demand of the other 'signs of true penitence' for his or her hare in the wrongs of the past.'

Even the harshest Rigorist does allow those whom God has ined together to be put asunder under certain conditions, for at we nowadays call a judicial separation is just as much a each of our Lord's principle as absolute divorce. In fact it used, ite properly, to be called divorce, divorce *a mensa et thoro*, vorce from bed and board as distinguished from absolute divorce, divorce *a vinculo matrimonii*. Provost Salmon had no doubt at our Lord's principle applied no less to judicial separation an to absolute divorce.

> 'It is clear from the Old Testament quotation that the breach of the marriage does not so much consist in the marrying again as in the separation by man of those who God has joined; consequently the sin is as much committed when man ordains a separation from bed and board as when a new marriage is sanctioned.'

shop Cosin, a rigid and representative High Churchman, made bones about it.

> 'Bed and board, or cohabitation,' he wrote, 'belong to the essence and substance of matrimony; which made Erasmus and Bishop Hall say that the distinction of these two from the bond is merely chimerical and fancy.'

e added that according to God's ordinance adultery and malici-is desertion dissolve the marriage.

No doubt Bishop Cosin, if he were to read the *Chronicles of*

Convocation, would find much in the debates on marriage and divorce there recorded chimerical and fancy. Chimerical theories about the nature of marriage, about an alleged Western Tradition which implicitly excludes the tradition of the great reformed Churches such as the Church of Scotland, about marriage as a sacrament are rife to-day in ecclesiastical circles. They have little enough to do with the moral consciousness and judgment. Their vogue tends to widen and deepen not only the 'gulf between the Church and the people,' but the gulf between the Church and many men of high principle and sound judgment to whom they appear to belong to a world of chimera.

Loyalty to his Church, to the tradition of his Church, to the responsibility of his office, to the national character of the Church of England, will constrain the parochial clergyman to ignore such fancies. He need not fear that vicious men and women who regard the marriage bond lightly will clamour for marriage in church after the dissolution of a previous marriage. They won't. In any case he has full power to stop them. His liberty of discretion, lawfully and irrevocably his, lays on him a responsibility of which he has no moral or legal right to divest himself, whatever Resolutions the Houses of Convocation may pass. Not, for one moment, should he submit to the highly unconstitutional attempt which a bishop may make to deprive him of it.

THE BIBLE AND WOMAN

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc.

THE Old Testament cannot be accused of undue feminist bias. The culture of the Hebrews was definitely of the patriarchal type, and the position of the female was subordinate to that of the male. There is a tendency, even, in the Old Testament to represent woman not only as the weaker vessel physically, but also morally. It was Eve who seduced the innocent Adam into disobedience, and who was on that account rightfully subjugated for the future: 'Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee.' Again, it was the treachery of the seductive Delilah that caused the hero Samson to fall into the hands of his enemies. 'It came to pass, when she pressed him daily with her words, and urged him, so that his soul was vexed unto death; that he told her all his heart. . . .' Here again the simple, ingenuous male is no match for the insistence and subtlety of the woman. Again, the villain of the piece in the contest between Elijah, the redoubtable

hampion of traditional religion and morals, against the weakness nd wickedness of Ahab, is the foreign queen, Jezebel, whose ame has been a proverb down the ages, and whose just recom-ense was to be thrown out of a window at the bidding of the mbitious Jehu, and to be eaten by dogs, so that when they went o bury 'this cursed woman' they 'found no more of her than the kull, and the feet, and the palms of her hands.'

Even the heroine Jael displayed the usual feminine duplicity. He asked water, and she gave him milk; she brought forth butter n a lordly dish.' 'Turn in, my lord, turn to me; fear not. And hen he had turned in, she covered him with a mantle.'

It must be admitted that the patriarch Jacob, though a man, as not devoid of guile, but he doubtless learned it from his nother Rebekah; and the narrative, perhaps, suggests that there as something feminine about this deceiver compared with his rother Esau, who was 'a cunning hunter, a man of the field,' hereas the smooth supplanter was 'a plain man, dwelling in ents.'

Not but what some women of the Old Testament are presented n a very attractive light. The charm of Rachael, who was 'beauti-ul and well favoured,' must have been considerable to have won he love of the self-centred and selfish Jacob, who agreed to serve aban seven years for her: 'And they seemed to him but a few ays, for the love he had to her.' But it is a known fact that the east worthy men have often the best luck with women. And then here is the daughter of Jephthah, his only child, whose name we re not told:

> 'And she said unto him, My father, if thou hast opened thy mouth unto the LORD, do to me according to that which hath proceeded out of thy mouth . . . And she said to her father, Let this thing be done for me: let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains and bewail my virginity, I and my fellows. And he said, Go. And he sent her away for two months . . . And it came to pass at the end of two months that she returned unto her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed.'

nd then, of course, there is Ruth:

> 'Intreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee: for whither thou goest, I will go; and where thou lodgest, I will lodge: thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: Where thou diest I will die, and there will I be buried: the LORD do so to me, and more also if aught but death part thee and me.'

an it be that this anti-nationalist pamphlet was written by a oman? We can scarcely imagine so, for it would hardly have een admitted into the Canon. And, of course, the background is f a strictly patriarchal culture and economy.

There is this to be said about the Old Testament pictures of women, that none of them is devoid of intelligence. Abigail is a good instance, and is in this respect in pleasing contrast to her husband. When he had acted according to his folly, she took matters into her own hands, and it must be admitted that she had formed a correct estimate of her man. 'Let not my lord regard this man of Belial, even Nabal: for as his name is, so is he; Nabal (fool) is his name, and folly is with him.' Perhaps Abigail is not unique among wives.

It is to be noted that the praise given to the virtuous woman in the last chapter of *Proverbs* is bestowed upon her for her devotion to her husband's interests:

> 'The heart of her husband doth safely trust in her, so that he shall have no need of spoil. She will do him good and not evil all the days of her life. She seeketh wool, and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands. She is like the merchants' ships; and bringeth food from afar. She riseth also while it is yet night, and giveth meat to her household. She considereth a field and buyeth it . . . Her husband is known in the gates, when he sitteth among the elders of the land . . . Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her.'

Perhaps as typical as any other episode of the strictly patriarchal standpoint of the Old Testament was Abraham's treatment of Hagar, though it was his wife Sarah who prompted him to act, saying 'Cast out this bondwoman and her son: for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac.'

> 'And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away: and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba.'

It is typical too that the lapses and errors of the wise king Solomon were due to the evil influence of the daughters of Eve. He 'loved many strange women,' and 'his wives turned away his heart.'

As the reader of the *Book of Ruth* may perceive, the patriarchal system, at any rate at that period, was by no means devoid of humanity. Boaz's orders to his men concerning the young widow were:

> 'Let her glean even among the sheaves, and reproach her not: And let fall also some of the handfuls of purpose for her, and leave them, that she may glean them, and rebuke her not.'

No doubt he had in mind the behest in *Deuteronomy*:

> 'When thou cuttest down thine harvest in the field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow.'

Thus, although, as has been pointed out, a neighbour's wife comes second in the Tenth Commandment and not first upon the

st of his property that one must not covet, she was valued by the usband so long as he lived, and was regarded as a proper object or help when he was dead. The patriarchal system did accept its esponsibilities. 'I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy,' aimed Job, recounting his works of piety. And, of course, the rophets do not cease to insist on fair dealing towards the ranger, the fatherless and the widow.

Lady Hosie's recently published *Jesus and Woman*[1] is of no ttle interest as a contribution to the theme of the Biblical attitude wards women. In her Preface she puts a crucial question :

> 'Now the Man Jesus was born in a certain land, and at a certain era of the world's history. He was born a Jew, brought up in a faith which still to-day honours Man above Woman. What did He think about that attitude to life? He proved himself a revolutionary with regard to much of the orthodox teaching of His day, and declared that Gentiles, sinners and lepers were as truly of the family of God as the righteous Pharisees : was he equally revolutionary concerning women? . .'
>
> 'When we truly read, mark and digest the Gospels, we find that every one of woman's experiences mattered to Jesus Christ, and at every stage of her life—in health and in sickness, as she lived alongside other women, as well as in the company of husband and children, Jesus never ignored her sex, or her femininity, but neither did He think of her only or chiefly because of it. To Him she was a human being, and His Father was her Father, as He told Mary Magdalene in the Garden.'

With regard to widows, the attitude of Jesus was identical with iat of the Old Testament Prophets.

> 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye devour widows' houses . . . '

ady Hosie's comment on this is :

> 'We can see the many devout widows who have been induced to hand over more and more of their little property, for the sake of what is called religion.' (p. 153).

An interesting, but perhaps not too edifying, volume could be ritten on the exploitation of women by the clergy. For the devout oman has ever been the legitimate and easy prey of the priest on e look out for cash to lavish on the Church. And even to-day any a parochial clergyman shamelessly takes advantage of that od nature and desire for self-immolation in a good cause which is a part of woman's nature to display.

The story of the Widow's Mites is also characteristic of the mpathy of Jesus for a person who was not only a widow, but also oor—and yet at the same time self-sacrificingly generous.

Of the recorded acts of healing by our Lord several are of omen. Luke records that there were with Jesus, along with the welve,

[1] Hodder & Stoughton, 1946; 8/6.

> 'Certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils, and Joanna the wife of Chusa Herod's steward, and Susanna, and many others, which ministered unto him of their substance.'

This passage indicates that it was not only men who followed Jesus, and that some of these women owed health and sanity to him. Of Peter's wife's mother Lady Hosie draws a picture which makes her real enough to the imagination :

> 'This very first healing of a woman of which a newcomer to the Gospels must read, is of a middle-aged mother—no, mother-in-law! She was probably grey of hair and worn of countenance, had known the pangs of child-birth, the trouble of rearing children, perhaps with small means; and maybe she had lost her husband.'

But the story of healing which attracts as much as any in the Gospels, is Mark's account, so full of detail, of the healing of Jairus' little girl and the woman who touched the Lord's garment.

> 'The woman, fearing and trembling, knowing what was done in her, came and fell down before him, and told him all the truth. And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be healed of thy plague.'

Lady Hosie dwells on the kindness and courtesy here shown :

> 'And when He knew the cause of this sudden drain upon His vitality, He uttered no word of reproof or resentment: He spoke only words of gentleness.'

The critics of Jesus denounced him as 'a gluttonous man, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.' Immediately after recording this, Luke introduces the story of the Penitent Woman, which Bacon describes as 'this most beautiful and touching of all the anecdotes of Jesus' message of forgiveness.' Mark's story of the woman with the alabaster box of ointment at Simon the Leper's house at Bethany is not necessarily a duplicate of this, for there is no suggestion here that the woman in question was a 'sinner.' Indeed, in John's version of the story she is Mary the sister of Lazarus, and the family, not Simon, are the hosts. But the saying of Jesus recorded by Luke, 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much,' sheds a clear light upon Jesus' attitude towards both men and women. It would appear that a capacity for selfless love cancels out whatever moral failings may seem to mar it. Not all 'sinners,' of course, are capable of this sort of love, and many 'righteous' are likewise incapable.

The real companion story to that of the Penitent Woman is that of the Woman taken in Adultery, that strange fragment so out of place in the Fourth Gospel—an aerolite from the Synoptic heaven buried in the Johannine earth. These two stories, coupled with Jesus' notorious companionship with 'sinners,' would cer-

ainly seem to indicate that he viewed a certain type of transgression as worthy of less reprobation than certain other kinds more frequently condoned — for example, greed, hardness, insincerity; ne sins, in short, of the respectable. 'Judge not, and ye shall not e judged; for with what judgement ye judge, ye shall be judged.'

The story of the Samaritan Woman is, of course, typically phannine because it is symbolical. Just as the cautious Nicodemus the type or symbol of the learned, devout and truly 'academic' ndividual and his reactions to 'the Light coming into the world,' o the Woman by the Well is the symbol of the common, ungenerate, unlearned human being, the 'natural man.' It is illuminating to note that Nicodemus is told that he must be 'born gain' before he can enter into the Kingdom of God; his learning nd religious culture will not gain him an entrance. In the case of ne Woman it is worth noting that Jesus opens his converse with er by making a request of her, 'Give me to drink,' as if the way to stablish contact with the common man is to ask him to do you a rvice, for this in all likelihood he will most willingly do, and this once makes for 'comradeship' and equality.[2]

Luke's story of Martha and Mary seems to suggest that Jesus garded women as intellectually and spiritually, as well as orally, men's equals.

It would appear both from *Acts* and the Pauline Epistles that omen took no inconsiderable part in the life of the primitive hurch. In *Acts*, Mary, the mother of Mark, Dorcas, Rhoda, ydia, Damaris and Priscilla are all mentioned. *Romans* contains number of women's names. And although Paul appears to have inctioned some what we should now consider quaint tabus or conentions with regard to the conduct of women, he was nevertheless uthor of the great saying that in Christ 'there is neither Jew nor reek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor male: for ye are all one in Christ.'

[2] '(Wisdom or the Holy Spirit) is offered by Jesus to all who, like the oman, are in the natural or psychic condition, a condition represented by her x husbands, for six is the number of the material world and the natural soul not and cannot be her true husband; while she is in this state she can only link of worship in terms of Jerusalem and Gerizim.' W. L. Knox, *Some ellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (Schweich Lectures, 1942), p. 64.

THE 'SEVEN IN THE TOWER'

By the Rev. A. T. Hart, M.A., B.D., Rector of King's Cliffe

WHEN James II succeeded his brother Charles on the throne, he was obstinately resolved that, come what may, he would restore Roman Catholicism in England. Because Parliament protested it was prorogued; and the army, the ministry, and the civil service were filled with Roman Catholics by means of the dispensing power. The Anglican Church was directly attacked by the revival of the Ecclesiastical Commission, which suspended the Bishop of London, put the three great Oxford colleges, Christ Church, University, and Magdalen under Roman rule, and expelled the Fellows of Magdalen for refusing to elect a Roman Catholic as their president. Popish institutes were established everywhere: 'a chapel in the City, a Jesuit school at the Savoy, a Girls' School in St. Martin's Lane, a Franciscan Friary in Lincoln Inn Fields, one for the Dominicans near by, a Benedictine house in Clerkenwell. A papal nuncio was publicly received at court. Steps were taken to revive a Roman Catholic hierarchy by the consecration of bishops. Pressure was put on the corporations of various kinds, such as the Inns of Court, to admit papists.'[1] In April, 1687, came the first Declaration of Indulgence, which granted the dissenters religious toleration and allowed them to enter political and civic office. This meant, of course, that in the future 'Cromwell's men,' along with Romanists and placemen of all religious persuasions, were to be introduced haphazard into the corporations, lord lieutenancies, and justiceships of the peace, for the eventual purpose of returning a Parliament to Westminster of their own kidney, which would repeal the Test and Habeas Corpus Acts, and legalize the Ecclesiastical Commission and all the rest of James' despotic creations.

Matters came to a head when James commanded the bishops to order that the second Declaration of Indulgence, proclaimed on April 27th, 1688, should be read in the churches. 'An order was made by the King in Council commanding the Declaration to be read at the usual time of divine service, in all the churches in London on the 20th and 27th of May, and in all those in the country on the 3rd and 10th of June.'[2] The king had every reason for expecting the clergy to submit, since they had already obeyed two

[1] G. N. Clark, *The Later Stuarts*, p. 118.
[2] J. Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution*, p. 241.

imilar requests from his brother. By an Order in Council, sug-ested so it is said by the Archbishop of Canterbury himself, Charles had secured the publication from the pulpit of his apology or the dissolution of his last two Parliaments, and also his de-laration on the Rye House Plot. In both instances the king laimed that as supreme Ordinary, and in accordance with the ubric in the Book of Common Prayer, he possessed the right of nstructing the minister to read his proclamations. James not un-aturally expected the same obedience; but he apparently forgot hat whereas his brother's declarations had been issued as a eneral command to the clergy as a whole, he was now attempting o saddle the bishops with the odious task of distributing and then nforcing the reading of the Indulgence in their own dioceses, and o would compel them to bear 'the dishonour of submission.' It as even been alleged that this divergence from the precedents as deliberate, and can be attributed to Father Petre, who ex-laimed exultingly that, in the words of Rabshakeh, 'they should at their own dung.' The bishops for their part received no warn-ng of this order until those of them who were in London saw it in he *Gazette*, barely sixteen days before the first reading was due o be held. That, too, was a carefully designed move; since for bvious reasons resistance would be only formidable if it were eneral, and owing to the slow communications of the day the relates were left with no hope of discovering the sentiments of he mass of the clergy in time. Consequently a great responsi-ility rested upon the men on the spot. Distinguished Anglican ymen like Rochester, Clarendon, Nottingham and Halifax re-used to commit themselves; and when a meeting of the London ergy was called it became apparent that the majority leaned wards submission. In these dire straits a message from leading ondon dissenters was read imploring the clergy not to publish he Declaration, and promising to stand by them for the sake of eligion and liberty. Dr. Edward Fowler, vicar of St. Giles', ripplegate, then addressed the gathering in these courageous ords: 'I must be plain. There has been argument enough. More ill only heat us. Let every man now say Yea or Nay. I shall be orry to give an occasion to schism, but I cannot in conscience ead the Declaration; for that reading would be an exhortation to y people to obey commands which I deem unlawful.' Stilling-eet, Patrick, Tillotson and Sherlock lent him their support, the pposition party was overborne, and it was decided unanimously ot to read the Declaration.[3]

[3] For a full account of the meetings of the London clergy, *vide*: *The Works of Symon Patrick*, Vol. IX, pp. 509-511.

Sancroft had also convened a meeting at Lambeth on Saturday, May 12th, which was attended by the bishops then in London, Dr. Tenison and the Earl of Clarendon. 'It was resolved not to do it [*i.e.* read the Declaration] . . . The resolution was to petition the King in the matter; but first to get as many bishops to town as were within reach.'[4]

The final and fateful conference was held the following Friday, May 18th. Seven bishops, London, Ely, Peterborough, Bath and Wells, Bristol, St. Asaph, and Chichester were present besides the Archbishop, and six representatives of the London clergy. Greatly heartened by the resolution of the Londoners and the unanimous support of the bishops, who had arrived in time, Sancroft drew up and wrote out a petition to the king, basing their 'great averseness' to publishing the Indulgence on the fact 'that Declaration is founded upon such a dispensing power, as hath often been declared illegal in parliament.'[5] This petition was worded in as moderate and unprovocative language as seemed compatible with firmness and clarity. All the prelates signed except Compton, who was still under suspension; and they rather rejoiced in the knowledge that they completed the sacred number of seven. Public imagination certainly showed itself quick in grasping at this piece of symbolism, since the sermons, medals and engravings of the period abound with references to the seven angels of the seven Churches of *Revelation*.

A little after six o'clock the six bishops, for Sancroft had been forbidden to show himself at court, set out in the Archbishop's barge. On landing at Whitehall, Lloyd of St. Asaph, who as the senior bishop now took the lead, after depositing his companions in the house of Lord Dartmouth, and taking Lake of Chichester with him, went straight to the Earl of Middleton, the Principal Secretary, to solicit his help; 'but he had been sick for a fortnight before, and so confined to his chamber.'[6] The two bishops then tried Sunderland. Would he be willing to deliver and read the petition to the king? No; the utmost that Lloyd could persuade the minister to do was to go at once to James and inform him of the bishops' arrival. And when at last they were ushered into the royal presence at 9 p.m., James received them very graciously and 'carried them into his closet.'[7] No doubt his spy, Cartwright of Chester, had warned him that something was afoot, and that the

[4] *The Correspondence and Diaries of the Earls of Clarendon and Rochester*, Vol. II, p. 171.

[5] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 478-479. *Cf.* J. Gutch, *Collectanea Curiosa*, Vol. I, pp. 335-337.

[6] J. Gutch, *Collectanea Curiosa*, Vol. I, p. 338.

[7] *Works of Symon Patrick*, Vol. IX, p. 511.

bishops would probably seek for some modification or explanation of the Declaration; but he did not dream for a moment of having any real trouble with them. Was not the Church of England irrevocably committed to the doctrines of non-resistance and passive obedience! So, late as the hour seemed, he consented to receive them, pleasantly bade them rise from their knees, and accepted the petition from Lloyd's hands. 'Oh,' he exclaimed, 'I know this hand, it is my Lord of Canterbury's.' Lloyd admitted that it was. But as James began to read, the royal manner changed, his brow darkened, and he broke out into angry exclamations. 'This,' he said, 'is a standard of Sheba.'[8] 'What!' he went on. 'The Church of England against my dispensing power! They that always preached it!' The bishops replied that they had never preached any such thing, 'but only obedience, and suffering when they could not obey.' James, however, was past listening to reasonable arguments. 'It surprises me,' he cried. 'I did not expect an address of this nature from you'; and looking Turner of Ely full in the face, added: 'Here are some I did not expect to see on such an occasion. Have not I supported you? This is a standard of rebellion.' The last expression he repeated over and over again throughout the interview. Lloyd replied pacifically, 'We have adventured our lives for your Majesty, and would lose the last drop of our blood rather than lift up a finger against you.' So said they all. Turner, indeed, cried out aghast, 'We rebel! We are ready to die at your Majesty's feet.' It was certainly significant that James' policy had driven the very men who later became such staunch non-jurors to resist him now. The core of the matter was, of course, the dispensing power. 'Sir, you allow liberty of conscience to all mankind,' said White of Peterborough, 'the reading of this Declaration is against our conscience.' The king retorted, 'Do you question my dispensing power? Some of you here have printed and preached for it, when it was for your own purpose.' That, White argued, referred only to what had been sanctioned by Parliament; and in reply to James' assertion that 'the dispensing power was never questioned by the men of the Church of England, Lloyd boldly said: 'It was declared against in the first Parliament called by his late Majesty, and by that which was called by your Majesty.'

Eventually, having declared he would keep the petition and not part with it, and that it was a standard of rebellion, James dismissed the bishops with the ominous words: 'God hath given me his dispensing power, and I will maintain it. I tell you, there are

[8] Referring to *II Samuel* xx, *i.e.* a standard of rebellion.

seven thousand men, and of the Church of England too, that have not bowed their knees to Baal.'[9]

They returned to Lambeth by water to find to their dismay that the petition had been published, and was already being hawked about in the streets. It is still uncertain who was responsible for this gross breach of faith. Sancroft maintained that he knew of no fair copy, except the one which had been delivered to the king. But such a copy, in Lloyd's handwriting, is to be found among the Tanner MSS.; and of the two Lloyd was the more likely to desire publicity than James. On the other hand, it is extremely doubtful whether he had the time to put such a plan into operation, and it appears more probable that Compton must shoulder responsibility for this action. He could quite easily have made a secret copy of the petition when it was under discussion, and later, while the bishops were still closeted with the king, published it in conjunction with Henry Sydney. Possibly he also wrote the letter, which was sent next day to every clergyman in England, advising them not to read the Declaration.

The following two Sundays, May 20th and 27th, the London clergy almost unanimously disobeyed James' order to read the Indulgence, and as the papal nuncio shrewdly reported to his master: 'The whole Church espouses the cause of the bishops. There is no reasonable expectation of a division among the Anglicans, and our hopes from the Nonconformists are vanished.' What was the king to do? Three courses were open to him. He could bring the bishops, separately, before the Ecclesiastical Commission. In that case he could be sure of their conviction; or he might go to the opposite extreme and, while expressing his deep resentment at their behaviour in disobeying the Head of the Church and disputing the royal prerogative, merely threaten to refer the matter to the next Parliament when it met, unless in the meantime their conduct had secured his forgiveness; or, finally, they could be prosecuted collectively before the Court of the King's Bench for publishing a seditious libel. Sunderland favoured the second, Jeffries the third solution. The latter was adopted, which was a mistake, since in the King's Bench, unlike the Ecclesiastical Commission, they might very well be acquitted.

Late in the evening of May 27th one of the king's messengers served Sancroft and the other six prelates with a summons

[9] Authorities for this interview: *James' Diary*: Macpherson; *Clarendon*, Vol. II, pp. 478-480; J. Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution*, pp. 249-251; *Works of Symon Patrick*, Vol. IX, pp. 511-513; E. H. Plumptre, *Life of Ken*, Vol. I, pp. 306-308; The Tanner and Longleat MSS.; J. Gutch, *Collectanea Curiosa*, Vol. I, pp. 338-340.

o appear personally before his Majesty in Council upon the ghth day of June next at five o'clock in the afternoon, to answer such matters of misdemeanour, as on his Majesty's behalf shall en and there be objected against them.'[10]

The 'Seven' were graciously received by James, who presided er a Privy Council, on which five papists, including Father etre, were permitted to sit in judgment upon bishops of the hurch of England. The accused were unaccompanied by coun-l, but they had been carefully instructed as to what to say and leave unsaid. Jeffries, who directed the attack, picked up a aper lying on the table and asked carelessly whether that was the etition which Sancroft had written and the bishops presented. he Archbishop took the document, and ignoring Jeffries, ad-essed the king directly: 'Sir,' he said, 'I am called here as a iminal . . . and no man is obliged to answer questions that may tend the accusing of himself.' James, furious at such legal quibbling, emanded harshly whether Sancroft denied his own hand. Still e Archbishop refused to answer; and Lloyd, boldly supporting m, declared: 'All divines of all Christian Churches agree in is, that no man in our circumstances is obliged to answer any ich questions.' Eventually Sancroft agreed to give an answer rovided the king positively commanded him to do so and no dvantage was afterwards taken of his confession. Whereupon mes reluctantly said: 'I command you to answer this question'; d Sancroft, reading the petition over, replied, 'I own that I rote this petition, and that this is my hand.' The six bishops like-ise acknowledged their signatures, but resolutely declined to say hether any others had been present at its signing.

They were told to withdraw; and, on being recalled, Jeffries formed them: 'It is his Majesty's pleasure to have you pro-eeded against for this petition; but it shall be with all fairness in Westminster-hall; there will be an information against you, which ou are to answer; and in order to that, you are to enter into a cognizance.' The bishops, however, had already made up their inds to stand firm on this issue, and the Archbishop said quietly at they would appear when they were summoned, but without ntering into a recognizance. Jeffries pointed out that there were ree ways in which the king might have proceeded: by commit-ent, by recognizance, or by subpoena out of the King's Bench; t, he added, 'His Majesty was not willing to take the common ay in proceeding against you, but he would give you leave to nter into recognizance.' The bishops replied 'that there was no

[10] *Clarendon*, Vol. II, p. 481.

precedent for it, that any member of the House of Peers should be bound in recognizance for misdemeanour'; and, despite every effort of Jeffries, James, and latterly the Earl of Berkeley, to persuade or brow-beat them into submission, they resolutely declined to budge from this position. Consequently they were sent to the Tower, whose Lieutenant was ordered to take them into custody 'for contriving, making, and publishing a seditious libel in writing against his Majesty and his government.'[11]

It has been popularly but falsely believed ever since that the bishops were sent to the Tower because they refused to read the Declaration of Indulgence, whereas in reality they went there because they stood firm on the purely technical point of their privilege as peers.

The 'Seven' were sent by water in one of the royal barges, in the vain hope of avoiding a popular tumult. 'Thousands, says Van Citters, probably an eyewitness, begged their blessing. Some persons ran into the water to implore a blessing from the prisoners. Both banks of the Thames were lined with multitudes, who, when they were too distant to be heard, manifested their feelings by falling down on their knees, and raising up their hands beseeching Heaven to guard the sufferers for religion and liberty.'[12] They were, of course, the heroes of the nation, and their friends and supporters, including several prominent nonconformists, flocked to visit them. Jeffries, who told Clarendon privately that 'he was much troubled at their prosecution,'[13] tried, together with Sunderland, to persuade James that the birth of the Prince of Wales, which was announced on June 10th, presented an admirable opportunity for a general pardon, including the bishops; but James, influenced by France, remained obstinate. So on June 15th 'the first day of the term, at the first sitting of the Court of the King's Bench, the Attorney-General moved for a habeas corpus returnable immediately, to bring the Bishops into Court.'[14]

When the 'Seven' left the Tower they had a sharp altercation with the Lieutenant, Sir Edward Hales, who expected them to pay the usual fees. The bishops refused to comply on the grounds that he had treated them with gross discourtesy; and Hales, furious at the rebuff, rudely reminded them that he might well have loaded

[11] Authorities for this meeting of the Privy Council: *Clarendon*, Vol. II pp. 481-483; Plumptre, *Life of Ken*, pp. 311-315; Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution*, pp. 253-258; D'Oyly, *Life of Sancroft*, Vol. I, pp. 281-284 Tanner MSS.; J. Gutch, *Collectanea Curiosa*, Vol. I, pp. 344-353.

[12] J. Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution*, p. 258.

[13] *Clarendon*, Vol. II, p. 177.

[14] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 177.

eir persons with chains and confined them within bare walls. The es, he roundly declared, were a just compensation for his for- arance. They answered, 'We lament the King's displeasure, but ery other man loses his breath who attempts to intimidate us.' gain the populace acclaimed them. They pleaded 'not guilty,' d this time allowed the court to take their recognizances to pear for their trial that day fortnight.

During the next few days the bishops were very busy, settling erything with their counsel. They remained quietly confident of successful verdict. Not so their principal enemies. Jeffries, who d advised James in the first instance to prosecute the bishops llectively, now began, in the face of these popular demonstra- ns, to hesitate and temporize. He told Clarendon that a public al was a mistake, and prophesied it 'would be of very ill conse- ence to the King in all his affairs.' 'As for the Judges,' he added a burst of candour, 'they are most of them rogues.' [15]

The night before the trial began an attempt was made, through e agency of Lord Dartmouth, to get at Turner of Ely and per- ade him to make his submission to James. This caused a flutter the episcopal dove-cots; but they need not have worried. The shop of Ely remained 'very steady.' The king himself had tried make sure of the result by a private interview with Sir Samuel stry, whose function it was to form the jury. Rumour said that e was determined on heavy sentences: large fines, imprisonment, d suspension from their episcopal functions and revenues; the st being used to finance Roman Catholic undertakings. The dges, of course, were hand-picked. Allibone was a Roman atholic, Wright and Holloway utterly servile, and Powell alone tained his impartiality.

The bishops were charged with the purely secular crime of ublishing a seditious libel under the pretence of presenting a mble petition to his Majesty'; and the trial opened with an tempt by the prosecution to prove that the petition had been ritten and delivered by the bishops. As handwriting experts were en unknown, the only way in which this could be done was by lling the clerk of the Privy Council and revealing the confessions ade in obedience to the king's command. Unfortunately, from the rown's point of view, the clerk had also to admit the bishops d confessed solely on the condition that no advantage would terwards be taken against them. Thus James' perfidy became undantly clear. Having proved the handwriting the prosecution d still to show that the petition was published, *i.e.* delivered;

[15] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. 179.

for the defence claimed the alleged libel had been written by San croft at Lambeth in Surrey, and hence the offence could not b tried at Westminster Hall in Middlesex. In vain the prosecutio strove to show the delivery; since although the bishops had owne to their signatures before the Privy Council, they never admitte handing the petition to the king. It looked as though the trial wa over, and the 'Seven' would escape on a technical point. Lor Chief Justice Wright began to sum up when Finch, one of th defending counsel, intervened, and advantage was taken of thi delay by Solicitor-General Williams to send out again urgentl for Sunderland, who could alone prove such a delivery.

Sunderland arrived in time; and happily, as it turned out, th whole tone of the trial changed. The bishops' lawyers decided t base the defence on the illegality of the dispensing power, tha history showed Parliament had never sanctioned it, and 'that th power to suspend was in effect a power to abrogate; that it was a assumption of the whole legislative authority, and laid the law and liberties of the kingdom at the mercy of the king.' This bol move, of which Somers' researches and admirable speech forme the core, took the prosecution completely by surprise, and the could only reply with bluster and abuse. The judges were divided Allibone, of course, was bitterly opposed to the bishops; an Wright, ignoring the arguments, instructed the jury that an writing calculated to embarrass the government and excite th people was *ipso facto* a libel. Holloway and Powell, on the othe hand, favoured an acquittal. The jury retired at 7 p.m. and re mained locked up all night, where they were kept without an heat, light or refreshment. According to Evelyn their decision wa delayed owing to the violent opposition of Arnold, the brewer o the king's house, but by 6 a.m. even his stubborn will had give way. So at 9 o'clock on the morning of June 30th, 1688, the fore man of the jury, Sir Robert Langley, gave their verdict: 'Not guilty.' 'Upon which,' Clarendon says, 'there was a most wonder ful shout, that one would have thought the Hall had cracked.'[16]

[16] References for trial: *State Trials*, Vol. XII, pp. 184-524; *Clarendo* Vol. II, pp. 179-180; J. Mackintosh, *History of the Revolution*, pp. 266-277 Evelyn, *Diary*, Vol. III, pp. 49; J. Gutch, *Collectanea Curiosa*, Vol. I, pp. 363 382; *Works of Symon Patrick*, Vol. IX, p. 513; Tanner MSS.; *Life of Joh Kettlewell*, Vol. I, pp. 76 *et seq.*

ALFRED ADLER

By the Editor

IGMUND Freud, Alfred Adler and Charles Gustave Jung constitute a psychiatrist trinity who by their originality, prodndity, and thoroughness in the field of psychological research d experiment have awakened and impressed the modern world the surprising use of psychology in healing the ills of human e. We do not claim that they are the first to do this. Mrs. Eddy d the Christian Scientists were in the field before them, not to the primitive Christian Church from whom the Christian ientists claimed to have derived their inspiration and example, Freud, Adler, and Jung united psychology and the art of aling on a scientific basis. Again, it must be admitted that in the dern medical world they have had many contemporaries who e practised psychiatry with excellent results, but it can hardly claimed that any of these practitioners have achieved the emince (not even the notorious M. Coué) which has been accorded these three. Moreover they come in a chronological sequence reud was born in 1856; Adler in 1870; Jung in 1875) which rresponds to the psychological evolution of their healing art. reud and Adler were Viennese in their environment, education, bial and professional life. Both were Jews by race, but it is not chout significance that while Freud passed from Judaism into eistic paganism, plainly demonstrated in his book *The Future an Illusion* (*Die Zunkunft einer Illusion*, 1927), Adler became a ristian, converted by the moral and spiritual claim of the most ofound and universal quality which that religion, rightly underod, makes on the totality of human nature.

Jung, although a pupil of Freud, was neither a Viennese nor a v, but the son of a Swiss pastor, and Basle and Zürich are his tres. This early Christian religious environment in Jung's case ot without significance.

Adler was never a pupil of Freud, but his associate. Adler, ough fourteen years younger than Freud, was already a qualid physician practising in Vienna before he joined the Freudian cle. He was quick to recognize the significance of Freud's earch in the sphere of sex, and the importance which he attached dreams. Much of this psychological research in Vienna was ried on, not in the scientific laboratory, but after the Socratic

manner by means of informal animated discussion by groups of interested students in Viennese cafés. It suggests the influence of the London coffee houses in the days of Dean Swift. The informality and freedom which these gatherings permitted were among their greatest advantages. You came when you liked, you left when you liked, without introduction and without apology. You ate and drank what you liked and were your own guest and host. You intervened in the discussion if you could get a hearing. There was no early closing and the members of a café group might continue their discussion until two o'clock in the morning. An interesting picture of this aspect of Adler's life in Vienna is given by Phyllis Bottome in her extraordinarily sympathetic, understanding, conscientious, modest and, not least, most readable volume on the Apostle of Freedom, Alfred Adler.*

Adler was never able to go as far as did Freud in his theories of the universality of phallic symbolism, and to what have seemed to not unsympathetic students of the Freudian psychology, the enormity of its sexual hypotheses. To what extent Adler differed from Freud in his *libido* theories it is not necessary to consider. Adler's break with Freud came primarily not in the sphere of theory but of practice. Phyllis Bottome has named Adler the Apostle of Freedom, and undoubtedly Freud's dominating personality and enslaving exercise of authority over the Freudian psychological group of which Adler had become a leading member, became increasingly irksome to Adler, who refused to remain chained to the Freudian chariot. Adler affronted Freud by demanding that the Freudian circle should undertake an analytical criticism of the methods and assumptions of Freudian psychoanalysis. But, although in the judgment of Adler freedom was essential to the welfare of the human personality, there are other qualities and factors no less essential. Adler was fundamentally a moral man, and the Freudian form of psychiatry seemed, and indeed rightly as wider experience has shown, to be 'without moral safeguards' (p. 236).

The drastic separation between Adler and Freud was created by another issue. Love, as Adler saw it, was as essential to human well-being as was freedom. Indeed it was more essential — but for Adler love and freedom are inseparables; they must go hand in hand. We can well understand why, at a later stage, the Nazi régime had no use for Adler's psychology, and regarded his disciples and students as a menace to the Nazi political movement.

**Alfred Adler, Apostle of Freedom*, by Phyllis Bottome. (Faber & Faber, 1939; Second Edition, 1946; 12/6.)

ne crash came when Freud asked, in reply to Adler's affirmation the claims of love both on the individual and on the social oup: Why should I love my neighbour? Freud's denial of the ty of the human being to love his neighbour determined finally e relation of Adler to Freud: 'Stand thou on that side for on s am I.'

Hegel has been blamed for initiating the evils of the Nazi gime by his affirmation of the divine authority of the State — its ht to exercise a totalitarian tyranny from which even the soul man and his religion are not exempted. Nietzsche has been amed for the evils of the Nazi régime by his doctrine of *Herren lk*, the right of the ruling race, represented by the 'great blonde ast,' to enslave inferior races and make them means, not ends, d entitled to no other treatment than as means to serve the ends their masters. By nature slaves, it is their lot to serve those who e their masters by nature. But in this triad of evil influences eud occupies a more evil eminence than either Hegel or etzsche, although in public estimation he is let off more lightly an Hegel and Nietzsche. Part at least of the evil influence exered by Hegel is due to his having been misinterpreted and so sapplied, and the same also may be said of Nietzsche, but in the se of Freud it is not so.

The apostles of freedom and love too easily sink into the pitls of seductive and undisciplined licence on the one hand and o sentimental idealism and emotional extravagance on the other, t there is nothing of this kind in Adler's presentation of love d freedom. With Adler the claims of scientific truth come first. ne right life must be in harmony with reality. It must conform nature, the true Nature of Man, and that true Nature can only realized and developed by practical morality, the recognition of hat are right social relations to our fellow human beings and by e loyal practical fulfilment of those obligations. There is one ng which Freud, Adler, and Jung have in common as psychiasts. They all believe in the possibility of what the Christian angelist calls conversion. What constitutes conversion in the se of these three psychiatrists and how it is to be accomplished ffers. But they are all agreed on the need of conversion, and the ssibility of conversion in the case of their patients at any rate. a neurotic or a psychotic can be delivered from neuroses and linquencies, how much more easily can this conversion be ected in the case of the normal human being, by means of the ght kind of psychological education. This stress upon the possiity and the need of conversion — or shall we call it the re-

orientation, liberation, and recreation of the personality of the individual as the fundamental article of faith of the psychiatrist?—is vividly emphasized by Phyllis Bottome. She writes:

> 'There is nothing in the whole history of medicine so upsetting to the ordinary layman, as that his sickness or mental troubles should require any improvement in his character. For this reason the tremendous statement, unsupported by fact, that human nature does *not* change (by which is indirectly implied that it cannot change, and that no one would wish it to, if it could) is too reassuring to be lightly given up. Both Freud and Adler in different ways challenged the truth of this statement.
>
> 'Freud got off on the whole cheaper than Adler, though he had plenty of opposition to face, and even ridicule, in his earlier life; but the change in the human being required by anyone who accepted Freud's theory was less exacting than the change required in character by the theories of Adler.
>
> 'People did not much mind having their *libido* released from suppressions, but to shift one's whole basis from a prestige goal to one of co-operation and love of one's neighbour, is a lifelong task' (p. 112).

Hence the great psychiatrist is not only a profound psychologist but also essentially an educationist. This comes out very clearly in the life of Adler and in a very notable piece of educational work which he achieved in Vienna. He secured permission from the Austrian Minister of Education to establish child guidance clinics as educational adjuncts to the *Volk* and *Haupt Schülen* in that city.

> 'Any child in these schools who showed backwardness, or was difficult in class, was brought by the teacher to the nearest clinic for advice and treatment, so that all children from six to fourteen years of age, in the city of Vienna, had access to this special psychological retraining between the years 1921 and 1934. The teachers were trained as well by attending lecture courses, held fortnightly at Czernin Platz' (p. 114).

The effect of this training in the reduction of criminality among the child population of Vienna was so impressive as to cause Adler's experiment to receive whole-hearted support from Glöckel, Minister of Education, until the disastrous suppression of the clinics by Schuschnigg.

The outstanding features of Adler's system of psychiatry can perhaps be best understood by attempting to indicate the meaning he attached to certain significant terms which he used—indeed coined in some cases—for purposes of exposition.

The inferiority complex. Adler claimed definitely to be the parent of this somewhat overworked concept. His great emphasis on this may be partly due to his Jewish origin and that he lived all his early years in the circle of *la petite bourgeoisie* in Vienna. We doubt very much whether in British or American life the inferiority

omplex plays anything like as large a part as would appear to be ie case in Central Europe.

'Adler taught that every human being's main instinct strives towards an advance from a minus or inferiority feeling towards a plus or superiority feeling; and that the difficulties of life, or the inferiority of organs themselves, can always be compensated for, by the individual's own efforts to overcome them.

'Adler's first well-known text-book, *Organ Inferiorities and their Compensations,* was largely accepted as a classic by his medical contemporaries.

'An inferiority feeling in the young of the human species was, in Adler's mind, never a failing or defect, nor in any way comparable to a neurosis, since the child is *really* helpless; and his physical and mental inferiority are facts of nature and not any attempts upon the child's part to evade responsibility.

'It is not unless the child *uses* this fact of his inferiority as an alibi to prevent himself from carrying out the contributions within his power that the inferiority *feeling* becomes a "complex," and prevents the child normal development' (pp. 139-140).

The family constellation. This stresses the enormous importnce of family life, developed in an atmosphere of love and freeom. Here again Adler's Jewish origin, in which an affectionate nd loyal family life plays a most valuable part, may well have een a factor in the emphasis which, as a psychiatrist, he laid upon . He was a firm believer in the supreme value of monogamous narriage and held that the pattern of the child's future life was reated before it was five years old, sometimes even before it was nree years old. Adler was an unrivalled child psychologist, and ne seminars which he conducted in his child guidance courses mazed and delighted those who attended them by his unfailing nsight and sympathetic treatment of the difficulties of childhood.

Neuroses, for Adler, constitute mental inhibitions and states f escapism by which the individual excuses to others and even to imself his failure to face the duties, difficulties and dangers of fe and to secure his right and honourable place in his social ircle. Their victim, the neurotic, is not the enemy of society, but is own enemy. He is not against his social environment but recogizes he is failing to make his proper contribution to it and to imself as a social unit. Adler was a master in the art of liberating, trengthening, and retraining the neurotic personality.

Delinquency, on the other hand, is not a form of moral ineffectiveness but of positive criminality. The delinquent child is ot one who seeks to escape from life's duties, but one who is reolved to get what he desires for himself regardless of the rights nd sufferings of others. It is the attitude of the sons of Eli: 'Nay,

but thou shalt give it me now; and if not, I will take it by force.' Adler always seized the opportunity to consort with criminals, and although he found them much harder to cure than neurotics, he had many successes to his credit.

Adler was not a believer in the Freudian methods of psychoanalysis. For him the surest tests of the health of a personality were to be found in the way in which it responded to the demands of work, marriage and family life, and social service and obligation. Adler's tests seem to have been always intensely practical. The question which he desired his patient to ask and for which Adler supplied the answer was this: What must I *do* to be saved? And salvation, he was convinced, could only be secured by fulfilling the command to love one's neighbour. By this fulfilment the good life and the happy life were possessed.

His book, *The Challenge to Mankind*, is claimed to be the most lucid, practical, and inspiring exposition of Adler's system and methods.

Adler believed in the equality of the sexes. He delighted in the saying of Erasmus that 'Women have different biological functions from men, but they should have the same education and the same virtues.' Another point to be emphasized is not only that Adler strove to see life steadily and see it whole but that he strove to see each of his fellow human beings as a unity. Analysis with him was subordinate to synthesis. This applied to the history of the personality as well as to the co-ordination and co-operation of all its functions and faculties.

Adler realized the value of the confessional as an institution of the Christian Church, when the confessor had a real understanding of the exercise of his office. He valued not least that finance did not come into it and that no fee passed between penitent and confessor. On the other hand, while realizing what a competent confessor sought to impart to his penitent, Adler does not seem to have realized what in many cases the penitent sought from the confessor. We recall a depressing statement made to us by a Roman priest who had had much experience in an important confessorship. He discovered a large number of his penitents had no wholehearted desire to advance in the moral and spiritual life—their aim was not 'Christian perfectionism.' All they desired to secure from the confessor was sacramental absolution. That secured, they went away happy, and reappeared time after time seeking the same release but without any indication that they had secured that grace which was enabling them to rise to higher things. Perhaps the psychiatrist, because of the motive with which his

ient seeks his aid, is in a better position to influence his patient's ral and spiritual liberation and development, than is the priest-fessor. Those who practise the confessor's office in the reformed rches, and there is certainly need for this, would do well to r in mind that their aim must be not the pronouncing of sacra-ntal absolution but the giving of such guidance and insight to penitent as shall enable him by means of the divine grace to rcome his moral and spiritual weaknesses.

Adler's external life was not free from many mundane cares l conflicts, but his truly beautiful nature enabled him to triumph ere many would have succumbed. Nothing is more significant his whole attitude towards the adverse things of life than his tude to his critics and opponents. 'They,' said he, 'may be my mies but I will not be theirs.' His later years were spent in le, if living in the U.S.A. and Great Britain can be so described er living in Central Europe. He died suddenly in Aberdeen in 37 when in the middle of delivering an imposing series of lec-es, an exposition of his system. Few men could have been more oved.

One question may be asked in concluding this brief and inade-ate survey. Is Adler's system complete in itself? It seems to us azingly helpful and inspiring. Obedience to the Second of the o Great Commandments of Jesus Christ as the real fulfilment the First Commandment is the very core of Adler's system, but eeded, at least for some, what Jung has been able to give in his tem, that stress on the direct love of God in the form of spiritual mmunion with Him which can give to some human personalities at loyal obedience to the Second Commandment has not been e to provide.

SOUTH AFRICA'S GREATEST BISHOP

By the Rev. D. L. Scott

THE name of Bishop Colenso is to-day scarcely remembered. It is vaguely associated with Old Testament criticism, and perhaps conjures up the ghosts of nineteenth-century ecclesiastical controversy. But that is about all. Of Colenso himself, his character and personality, it would be safe to say that hardly anything is generally known. The object of this paper is to suggest that he has been forgotten most undeservedly.

There are several reasons for believing this to be the case, and the fact that he was the first English scholar to arrive at a profound understanding of the structure and nature of the Old Testament is only one of them. His conscientious and self-sacrificing work as a missionary bishop is another. One might have thought that this alone would have sufficed to ensure for Colenso an honoured remembrance. But instead it appears that the recollection of the one has been made or allowed to cancel out that of the other. Yet Colenso was far more than a sound scholar and good bishop. So spacious was his conception of true religion, so bold his devotion to truth and right, that he might justly be called a prophet. His name, at least among liberal churchmen, should not be without honour.

John William Colenso was born in Cornwall in 1814. He had an interrupted education, for whilst he was still a boy, his father, a mineral agent, suffered a serious reverse in fortune. At the age of seventeen he found himself obliged to support the family and obtained a post as usher at a school in Dartmouth. His duties occupied him from five in the morning till eight at night. Nevertheless he managed to keep up his studies and eventually he was able to proceed to Cambridge, having gained a sizarship at St. John's. There in spite of his poverty, he had a brilliant mathematical career; he became Second Wrangler and Smith's Prizeman, and was subsequently elected to a fellowship.

In 1839 he became a housemaster at Harrow, but there he was consistently unfortunate. His house was destroyed by fire, and the depressed nature of the school rapidly placed him in debt. Consequently he returned to St. John's in 1842 and was appointed to a college tutorship, which he held for the next four years.

In 1846 Colenso married and was presented to the college living of Forncett St. Mary in Norfolk. It is said that his ministry

ıs there were so much appreciated that for upwards of forty ırs his name was still remembered with affection. At the same e he was gaining a wider reputation as a writer of mathematical t-books, but as a theologian he seems so far to have been quite known.

On November 30th, 1853, he was consecrated first Bishop of tal. On the eve of his departure for South Africa he published ook of selections from the writings of F. D. Maurice, who had t been deprived of his professorship at King's College, London. is was the first indication of the direction in which his sym-hies were tending. For the next nine years he was actively en-ged on his missionary labours and in studying the Zulu tongue. ring this time he compiled a Zulu grammar and dictionary, and nslated into that language the Prayer Book, the whole of the w Testament and parts of the Old.

It was while engaged on this last undertaking that Colenso's ubts concerning the historicity of the Old Testament narratives, rticularly those of the Pentateuch, became thoroughly aroused. e Bishop describes the incident thus:

'While translating the story of the Flood, I have had a simple-minded, but intelligent, native . . . look up and ask, "Is all that true? Do you really believe that all this happened thus?" . . . My heart answered in the words of the Prophet, "Shall a man speak lies in the name of the Lord?" I dared not do so. . . . I dared not, as a servant of the God of Truth, urge my brother man to believe that which I did not myself believe, which I knew to be untrue, as a matter-of-fact, historical narrative.' (*The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.* One vol. edn., 1865; p. 8 f.).

Gradually he came to see that the whole of the Pentateuch was ually unhistorical. The discovery came at first as a severe ck; he trembled at the results of his enquiries, and felt that he st, as a matter of course, resign his episcopal office. But his firm ief that all truth must necessarily be of God did not desert him, l at length, before any decisive step was taken, he realized that vas his duty to remain within the Church, if that were legally sible, and so to uphold within it the absolute sacredness of th.

'I cannot but believe,' he says, 'that our Church, representing as it is supposed to do, the religious feeling of a free, Protestant nation, requires us now as in the days of the Reformation, to protest against all perversion of the Truth, and all suppression of it, for the sake of Peace, or by mere Authority. . . . I hold that the foundations of our Church are laid upon Truth itself, and not upon mere human prescriptions, and that the spirit of our Church . . . fully recognizes my right to use all the weight of that office, with which the Providence of God has invested me, in declar-

ing the Truth, and recommending the subject of this work to the though ful consideration of English Churchmen' (*op. cit.*, p. 23).[1]

And Colenso goes on to express the hope that

> 'We shall not rest until the system of our Church be reformed, an her boundaries at the same time enlarged, to make her what a Nation Church should be, the Mother of spiritual life to all within the realr embracing, as far as possible, all the piety, and learning, and earnestnes and goodness, of the nation.' (*ibid.*)

Colenso's work on the Pentateuch appeared in five parts b tween 1862 and 1865.[2] As already indicated, it was the result the minute care which he had spent upon the subject in the cours of his translations; it also owed much to his mathematical abilit and to his study of contemporary German criticism. Our admira tion for his work must be enhanced when we remember that h reached conclusions which are in substance those accepted to-da in a remote African colony, whilst scholars at home were sti defending the verbal infallibility of both the Old and the Ne Testaments.

There were, it seemed, few who shared the Bishop's hopes f the Church, of which mention has been made above. The Bisho of Capetown, a man of fanatical temperament who held that n clergyman had the right to deviate from the most rigid traditio alist standpoint, instituted proceedings against him, and a tri was staged at Capetown in July 1863. Colenso was sentenced deposition, one ground of the sentence being that his teaching i volved Nestorianism! He refused to acknowledge the legality these proceedings and appealed to the Queen in Council. H appeal was upheld, and it was ruled that the Bishop of Capetow had acted without authority. Colenso was therefore restored to h See,[3] and the Colonial Bishoprics Fund was obliged to pay hi his stipend with arrears.

No doubt the manner in which Colenso had approached h task of Pentateuchal criticism was provocative. But his fortl rightness, though deplored by Dean Stanley, was altogeth salutary. Stanley and others had already treated much of the Ol Testament poetically and allegorically, but their writings hard disturbed the illusion of biblical infallibility upon which trad

[1] Colenso was encouraged by the decision of the Court of Arches in 18 that a clergyman's ordination promises must be held only to imply 'a *bo fide* belief that the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvatio and that to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.'

[2] Two further parts subsequently appeared, Part VI in 1871 and Part V in 1879.

[3] *Crockford*, usually so accurate, still states that Bishop Colenso was d posed from his See (1941 edn., p. 1939).

onalism still rested serene and comfortable. But the Bishop of atal treated his subject neither as poetry nor as allegory; he mply demonstrated that large parts of the Old Testament, and particular the Pentateuch, were radically unhistorical. The suffi- ency of his demonstration must be judged by the outcry that it ised.[4]

It was a bold challenge to make, for at once it became clear at the whole problem of inspiration was at issue. The fallibility the Bible carried with it the fallibility of our Lord. If Moses ere not the author of the Pentateuch, as He had assumed, plainly ur Lord could not have been omniscient. Could He then have en divine?

> 'It is perfectly consistent,' says Colenso, 'with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity to hold, as many do, that, when he vouchsafed to become a "Son of Man," he took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited.' (*op. cit.*, p. 22.)

here does not seem anything startling about these words to-day, it it should be remembered that Bishop Gore caused no small stir hen he suggested in *Lux Mundi* that Christ's knowledge was mited and conditioned by the age in which He lived. Colenso's ork preceded *Lux Mundi* by nearly thirty years.

But there was also another problem that had been raised, and a peculiarly unambiguous form. It was simply this: what was e attitude of the Church of England to be towards new and rhaps unpleasant truth? Colenso by, as it were, the accidental ture of his studies, had become a protagonist for the truth and r the right of the English clergyman to retain an open mind. If is is denied him,

> 'is it,' the Bishop asks, 'any wonder that a young man of University distinction and intellectual activity, however ready he may be, for the love of God and his fellow-men, to engage himself in the . . . labours of the ministry of souls, should yet be found unwilling to . . . find himself . . . stripped at a stroke of all his means of livelihood, as one of the pains and penalties of thinking?' (*op. cit.*, p. 85).
>
> 'We cannot,' he says elsewhere, 'serve God by wilfully shutting our eyes to the truth, and walking still in darkness, when He is pleased to give us light. It would be no acceptable worship of Him, Who is the very Truth, to do so; it would be sinful and displeasing in His sight' (*op. cit.*, p. 267).

[4] Colenso quotes, amongst others, the following example: 'In the single ort letter of one of my Episcopal Brethren, forbidding his clergy to allow e to minister in his diocese, the following expressions appear, applied either myself or to my work: "unfounded," "false," "childish," "heretical," blasphemous," "abominable," "unhappy," "blind," "daring," "ignor- t self-sufficiency," "instrument of Satan," "poor Bishop Colenso".' (*op.* ., p. 168, n.).

Colenso had given the death blow to biblical infallibility. Though he sympathized with those who mourned its death, he could not share their grief.

> 'We might wish, perhaps, . . . to be able to fall back upon the notion of an Infallible Book or an Infallible Church. But God has not willed it so. . . . His Spirit has quickened us, that we may do, as living men, His work in the world. He will not suffer us to abdicate the glorious office to which He calls us. We *must*—not only claim and exercise the *rights*, but —bear the *responsibility* of private judgment, upon the things of the life to come, as well as of this world.' (*op. cit.*, p. 270 f.).

For himself, however, this new approach to the Scriptures brought with it feelings not of regret but rather of relief:

> 'God is my witness! what hours of wretchedness have I spent at times, while reading the Bible devoutly from day to day, and reverencing every word of it as the Word of God, when petty contradictions met me, which seemed to my reason to conflict with the notion of the absolute historical veracity of every part of Scripture, and which, as I felt, *in the study of any other book*, we should honestly treat as errors or misstatements without in the least detracting from the real value of the book!' (*op. cit.*, p. 25 f.).

It brought to him, indeed, far more than relief from doubts and difficulties; it became a power in his life charged with spiritual liberation. Henceforth it was his object to show that the truth for which he was contending was in no way negative, as though it were merely that the Bible is full of errors and mistakes; the truth which had filled his mind and which he longed to make plain was the immeasurable gain to religion when set free from absolute bondage to the written word, whilst the value of the Bible is by no means diminished in consequence.

> 'Let us,' he says, 'recognize the voice of God's Spirit, in whatever way, by whatever ministry He vouchsafes to speak to the children of men; and realize the solid comfort of the thought that—not only in the Bible, but also out of the Bible—not to us Christians only, but to our fellow-men of all climes and countries, ages and religions—the same Gracious Teacher is revealing, in different measures, according to His own good pleasure, the hidden things of God . . . Yet, with all this we cannot be blind to the supreme excellence of that Book, which tells us God's truth, and declares the divine Will more fully and authoritatively than any other, and which we therefore call the "Word of God"—the Bible. . . . Throughout the sacred writings, both of the Old and New Testament, there breathes a Divine Spirit of life and holiness, such as we find nowhere else in the whole compass of heathen literature.' (*op. cit.*, pp. 68, 70).

In this spirit Colenso returned to Natal in 1865,[5] where he received an enthusiastic welcome. Immediately upon his return he

[5] Colenso had come to England in 1862 to see his work through the press. The Bishop of Capetown's subsequent action led to his remaining in this country until after the judgment of the Privy Council.

eached a remarkable course of sermons[6] which illustrate what e religion of an enlightened understanding, freed from bibli- atry, can be.

'It is Our Father's Will . . . that our love towards Him should abound yet more and more in the clearer, fuller knowledge of Himself, which the study of His Works supplies to us, no less surely than the study of His Word. We cannot be truly glorifying God if we do not make use, according to our powers and opportunities . . . of growing in this knowledge.

'But so too, as the character of God is better known, will love to our fellow-man the more abound. As St. Paul's heart embraced both Jew and Greek, "barbarian, Scythian, bond, and free"—in one holy brotherhood of Christian love, so shall we, taking those larger views of the Power and Wisdom and Goodness of God, which we learn especially from the study of His Works, believe that the message of the Gospel is meant for all mankind—that His Fatherly Love embraces all His children—that His Living Word is even now speaking in the hearts of all, that Word which is the Light and Life of men' (*Natal Sermons,* pp. 10-11).

Some of his hearers were no doubt apprehensive of their shop's critical researches. To them he addresses himself thus:

'Whereas, in the first sudden burst of the discovery that the traditionary teaching is unsound and delusive . . . the effect may be . . . most painful and distressing . . . yet, after a while, if only the heart be pure and truth-loving, if only the soul be waiting patiently on God, there will come a sweet serene light out of the darkness; the clouds will roll away, the face of nature become bright and calm around them, and in God's own Light they will see light. They will see that the foundations of their faith stand fixed and sure in the Eternal Rock of God's unchangeable Wisdom and Love. They will see that that Love is higher and deeper than men's thoughts about it. They will see that God's Spirit has been teaching the hearts of men in all ages, in all countries—that all great truths which have ever gained a mighty mastery over the minds of men, whether in the Church of Christ or out of it, have come from the Living Word, the Fount of Truth.' (*op cit.,* p. 38.)

But although his exposition is direct and vigorous, Colenso is ever aggressive or unduly controversial, in spite of the bigotry at so often opposed him. He often pleads for patience and lerance:

'If we cannot altogether be "likeminded" in our views of religious truth—if the body of the eternal truth is so vast, so high that we cannot attain to it, so broad that we cannot grasp it, so deep that we cannot fathom it . . . yet God grant us to be *"likeminded towards one another"* —to bear with one another's honest doubts and differences—to regard one another with brotherly kindness and charity, as fellow-servants of one household, as children of one great family.' (*op. cit.,* p. 69 f.)

ndeed he was well able to do so, for he saw how superficial were e grounds upon which his opponents took their stand, and how

[6] *Natal Sermons,* London, 1867.

the essential truth of Christianity was neither impaired by his own criticisms nor strengthened by their apologies.

> 'I doubt not for one moment that, when all these accretions of later growth are taken away, as they surely will be, by the progress of scientific research, the true Divine Beauty of Christianity—of the religion of Christ—of the religion which Jesus taught, and in the practice of which He lived and died—will shine out with greater lustre than ever. I doubt not—nay, I am sure—that the Gospel of Christ in its deepest, fullest sense—though wearing the outward garb, as any message addressed to human beings must at first have done, of the thoughts and knowledge of the time in which it was originally given forth—will appeal in all ages to what is deepest in man, and call his inner sense to "taste and see that the Lord is gracious".' (*op. cit.*, p. 112).

In view of this it is not surprising that once Colenso's mind had been set free, he did not, like some other critics, stop short with the Old Testament, but applied his critical reasoning to the New Testament as well. But he was never merely destructive, and he was always guided by an earnest desire to be loyal to the truth. Thus of the Gospel accounts of demoniac possession he writes:

> 'We cannot indeed receive them as historically true. To do so in the light of the present day, would be to shut our eyes wilfully to those revelations of His Power and Wisdom and Goodness, which God has made known to us, and of which the Jews and Christians of old, the Prophets and Apostles, knew nothing. But they contain, notwithstanding, a most instructive lesson for us. They tell us very plainly what a deep and lasting impression our Lord's works and words must have made upon the men of that age, so that even, one or two generations afterwards, such acts as these should have been ascribed to Him. They tell us of the *spiritual* power which He wielded, by which the blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the deaf heard, while the poor had the gospel preached unto them' (*op. cit.*, p. 339).

He showed how the excellence of the Gospel is moral and spiritual, whilst to suppose that it is miraculous is sheer idolatry:

> 'The voice of the Father of spirits is heard in the heart alone. Those who refuse to listen to it—who are unable or unwilling to recognize the Presence of Goodness, Love and Truth amongst them—who despise or disregard that Presence, and call for "signs and wonders," call upon mere Power as their God—brute power, we may call it, power displayed in the infraction of Order, in the stupefaction of the faculties of those who witness it—such persons are in very deed "idolaters"; they are widely distinguished from those spiritual worshippers, who "worship the Father in spirit and in Truth," and whom "the Father seeks to worship Him"' (*op. cit.*, p. 162).

So, in an earlier sermon, he had asked:

> 'Are these words (*i.e.* the Beatitudes) true because they are written in the Bible, or merely because they were spoken by the Lord Jesus Christ himself? Are they not felt at once by us to be essentially, eternally true? . . . Do we not know that they are among those words which "shall never pass away"—which we, human beings, in our best estate—we who are all, by the great work of God's redeeming Love, made children

of God . . . brethren of Christ . . . are not, I say, such words as these among those which, by the unanimous verdict of the human mind, in its best and holiest moments, we "bind on earth, and they shall be bound in heaven"?' (*op. cit.*, p. 28 f.).

Accordingly it is a divinely human Christ, the perfect example nd inspiration of humanity, that Colenso sets before us:

'How is it, then, that we are able at once to appeal to Christ's Example, as the perfect model of what human beings ought to be or ought to do, under all circumstances? It is because we appeal to the *spirit* of His life — to the *principle* which ruled it — to that conformity to the perfect Will of God, that desire to please His heavenly Father, that surrender of His own will to God's Will, which He manifested on all occasions. And, taught as we ourselves are by the Divine Word—enlightened by the Light which is the Life of men — we are able in our own minds to fill up what is wanting, for our actual guidance amidst the duties of life — to say to ourselves, in different situations, "in this way Christ would act or would have acted." We are able to set before us an ideal Christ, a perfect image of the Divine Man.' (*op. cit.*, p. 315.)

It may perhaps be supposed that whatever the extent of olenso's merits as a scholar and a preacher, he could hardly have een fitted for the work of a missionary bishop. No doubt he ould have done justice to a wider and more intellectual sphere, ut to suppose that he was unsuited to the especial work he had ken in hand would be a gross mistake. On the contrary, his wide nd practical sympathies together with his clear-sighted grasp pon the fundamental simplicity of the Christian Gospel rendered im peculiarly competent to fulfil the duties of his office. We have lready seen that it was whilst translating the Bible into Zulu that is critical enquiries were aroused. Besides this, he took an active nterest in native education, and prepared numerous pamphlets on istory, geography, astronomy, and other subjects, to facilitate its evelopment.

Unhappily, his work in Natal was seriously hampered by the xtraordinary conduct of Robert Gray, Bishop of Capetown. This stimable prelate, thwarted in his attempt to remove Colenso from is See, persuaded most of the latter's clergy to disown the au- nority of their diocesan, and publicly warned the natives against im. Not content with these measures, Gray had the consummate ffrontery to consecrate a rival bishop of his own choosing, who alled himself the 'Bishop of Maritzburg' — the capital and athedral city of Natal. It is pleasing to note that whatever bless- ngs attended the labours of this individual,[7] Colenso retained not nly the confident affection of the natives, but a warm popularity

[7] He was the Rev. W. K. McRorie. *Crockford* erroneously places him mongst the Bishops of Natal (1941 edn., p. 1939).

amongst the English settlers as well, who came in large numbers to hear him preach.

But towards the end of his life even this popularity was sacrificed for the sake of the Zulus, whom he believed to have been wronged. Henceforth, apart from them, his isolation became almost complete. He had always been keenly sympathetic towards them and had from the first refused to impose monogamy as a necessary condition of baptism, for he realized that if a native were obliged to abandon all save one of his wives, the rest would suffer most unjustly in consequence. Though himself of such intellectual eminence, he looked upon every man, even the humblest and most ignorant, as a child of God and therefore to be treated with reverence. He had often lifted up his voice against injustice and social wrong. Now he was to give the most signal proof of the sincerity of his feelings, and of his fidelity to those who had been placed beneath his spiritual care.

Some ten years after Colenso had returned to Natal it was discovered that certain Zulu tribesmen were in possession of unregistered firearms. They had in fact received them in lieu of wages from British settlers, but this was not known to the authorities, and their chief, Langalbalele, was required to account for them. This he declined to do, refusing even to be present in court. It appeared afterwards that he was afraid of treachery, not without reason, but meanwhile he was sentenced to death, though the sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life. Colenso felt that the unfortunate chieftain had been unjustly treated, and failing to obtain redress for him in Natal, he came to England expressly for that purpose. He obtained an audience with the Colonial Secretary, Lord Carnarvon, and the case was examined afresh to the considerable benefit of Langalbalele.

Dean Stanley on this occasion offered to Colenso the Abbey pulpit, but he declined the honour lest it should appear that his visit to England was for controversial as well as humanitarian reasons. Writing to Stanley the Bishop said :

> 'I need hardly say that under other circumstances I should have gladly carried out your wishes . . . [But] I did not come home to assert my own personal position in the Church of England . . . and I have no wish whatever to occupy the few remaining days of my stay in England with any such contention as might seem to be implied by my preaching at Westminster.' (*Life of Stanley*, II, p. 292 f.)

But when he returned to his diocese, Colenso found that his popularity except with the Zulus had gone. The colonists were embittered by his action, but the Bishop's attitude did not waver. Before long he was vigorously defending, this time no petty chief-

in, but the Zulu king, Cetshwayo, and as the smouldering unrest rew towards open rebellion, Colenso steadily maintained that it as not the fault of the natives, but the policy of the Governor, Sir artle Frere, which was responsible for the calamity. It was these oubles which hastened the Bishop's death, which took place after brief illness on June 20th, 1883.

There is something almost pathetic in the thought of this arned and saintly man, who had for so long been misunderstood, used and vilified, dying almost unbefriended save for the rude, ntutored savages, to whom, however, he had become 'the father his people,' and for whom he had sacrificed 'his dearest pros-ects, and valuable friendships, cemented by the most trying cir-mstances.'[8] But his magnanimity was not quite unrecognized. t a stormy meeting of the S.P.G., when Colenso's name had been entioned, Stanley, only a few months before his own death, efended him with characteristic vigour:

> 'The Bishop of Natal,' he said, 'is the one colonial bishop who has translated the Bible into the language of the natives of his diocese. He is the one colonial bishop who, when he believed a native to be wronged, left his diocese, journeyed to London, and never rested till he had procured the reversal of that wrong. He is the one colonial bishop who, as soon as he had done this, returned immediately to his diocese and his work. For these acts he has never received any praise, any encouragement, from this, the oldest of our missionary societies. For these deeds he will be remembered when you who censure him are dead, buried, and forgotten' (*op. cit.*, p. 295).

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S BRAINS TRUST

Questions for the Brains Trust should be of general interest. hey should be written on a postcard and sent to The *M.C.* rains Trust, The Vicarage, Stithians, Truro, Cornwall.

QUESTION I

Who are the Powers of Evil?

The writer of *Ephesians* says (vi, 12): 'Our fight is not against flesh and lood, but against authorities and powers, against the world-rulers of this rk night, against the spirits of evil in the heavens.' Clearly he is referring spiritual, that is to say personal, powers of evil, superhuman both in power d malignancy. The existence of such beings cannot be proved or disproved. l we can say is that we have no satisfactory evidence — evidence such as ould convince a man of science or historian — that such beings exist. To

[8] *Life of Stanley*, II, p. 290.

attribute evil to the machinations of such beings only pushes the problem of the origin of evil one stage back, and the question put to Crusoe by his man Friday, as to why God permitted Satan to exist, remains pertinent, and unanswered. Perhaps the most rational view to take is to be found in the words of Jesus: 'Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies. These are the things which defile a man.' This is not to endorse any theory of the complete depravity of man. Nothing in this world is to be had without paying a price; and the price mankind has to pay for the complexity of his psychological make-up compared with that of other animals, is that just as we have it in us to rise far above them mentally, morally and spiritually, so also we have it in us to reach depths of moral and spiritual degradation that no creature less gifted can possibly reach. Perhaps the chief power of evil each man has to contend with is — himself. J. C. HARDWICK.

I am in essential agreement with Mr. Hardwick's answer. The existence of spirits can neither be proved nor disproved, but it is difficult to reject the belief that God is spirit and personal, and that we also are spirits and personal, having the source of our being in God. At some point in the history of man a breach has taken place in the right relationship between God and man as a free spirit. All the moral evil in the world results from this, and can only be removed by the restoration of the broken relationship, the recovery of the sense of what Paul calls 'sonship.' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself,' but we still await the full realization of this.

S. H. HOOKE.

I agree with Professor Hooke that God is spirit and personal, and man likewise. And I think we must just admit that somehow there came into being 'a breach in the right relationship between God and man as a free spirit.' This at any rate is the presupposition with which we start in our approach to our religion, just as the man of science starts his study of natural phenomena with the presupposition that they are patient of a rational explanation. You cannot dispense with presuppositions in any sphere of mental and spiritual activity. As for evil spirits, whether they exist or not, that is, I venture to think, no concern of ours; since as Christians we have been liberated from their dominion. J. C. HARDWICK.

I agree with the gist of both Mr. Hardwick's answer and Professor Hooke's comment. While however the existence of evil spirits can neither be proved nor disproved, psychical research appears to yield data which may be interpreted as the activity of discordant selves, *e.g.* poltergeists of which so much has been heard recently. Also the data provided by dreams, dissociated personalities, and multiple personalities appear to show that in addition to the conscious will being the source of evil there are within all of us secondary selves which sometimes take possession of our conscious life and make havoc of the mind-body instrument as well as do evil to others, if left uncontrolled. To some of those around Adolf Hitler he appeared at times to be a medium controlled by a demonic power. H. C. SNAPE.

I agree with Mr. Snape that good evidence exists of the occurrence of phenomena which lend themselves to interpretation in terms of evil spirits and their activities. Roman Catholics condemn spiritualism not because there is nothing in it, but because it brings addicts into contact with evil spirits. A friend who has worked as a missionary in Central Africa has told me that

re one can hardly avoid belief in the existence of evil spirits. One of the st potent factors in the appeal which Christianity made to the ancient ld was its claim to free the believer from the power of evil spirits. Is it ncidence that the present decline in Christian faith is being accompanied a revival of faith in evil spirits, occultism, and so on? But even if one pts the existence of evil spirits, one has to account for their origin if one es to discover the ultimate source of evil. J. C. HARDWICK.

QUESTION II

(a) Is it correct to say that a true understanding of the fact that God as y Spirit operates in creation, in man, and in history is the most vital of the Christian faith?

(b) Is it an adequate statement of what is essential to the Christian faith ay that there is only one God, our Father in Heaven, and that He has n revealed to us by Jesus of Nazareth?

The answer to both these questions depends upon what is considered to be essence of the Christian Faith. Statements of what Christianity essen- y is have varied from its beginning, as the New Testament itself bears ness. For my own part I should say that in the history of the Christian rch the following beliefs expressed in varying form have proved essential vital: (1) that the goal of life is the achievement of the true relationship veen God and man; (2) that this true relationship is found in Jesus of areth; (3) that the union of the human with the divine in Jesus reveals to se who are ready to perceive it that God sympathizes and co-operates with , sharing his sufferings and giving him the power which comes from a se of release from all inner conflict. The experience of the resurrection of is crucified did this initially for His disciples and thus traditionally is in forefront of Christian doctrine. These beliefs would imply that God is rative in His universe and also that there is only one God, our Father in ven, and that He has been revealed to us by Jesus of Nazareth. But both e statements fall short of expressing what has been the vital and essential ent of the Christian Faith because they omit to state what has been the istian dynamic, *i.e.* its power to provide a vision of life's purpose satisfy- to man's rational, moral, and spiritual consciousness, to give the consola- and hope which comes from the belief that God sympathizes with man, and esolve the conflicts of the divided self into a harmonious personality.

H. C. SNAPE.

The two statements are all right so far as they go, and they have the antage of being brief. Mr. Snape, however, is right in saying that they t to state what is the Christian dynamic; and perhaps the creeds of the ure (if there are any) will concentrate more upon what the Christian reli- n can *do* than upon the speculative theories which lie behind it. A thing—n a religion—*is* what it *does*. A 'correct' faith, even if it is 'modernist,' f no use to anyone unless it can *do* something, or enable the person who is it to do something he could not have done without it. 'With the help y God I will leap over a wall,' said the Psalmist, whose religion evidently d *do* something for him, and was therefore not *null* as religion so often ns to be. J. C. HARDWICK.

(*a*) Here it may be pointed out that Judaism, from the time of the eighth- ury prophets and onwards, has held that the Spirit of God has from the inning been active in creation, in man, and in history; so that we cannot

say that this belief, important as it is, constitutes the most vital part of th Christian faith. The central fact in Christianity, rejected by Judaism, is tha God has done a new thing; the Eternal has entered into Time; God was i Christ, reconciling a world unto Himself. The dynamic of Christianity Christ crucified, God's power and God's wisdom.

(*b*) I could not say that this is an adequate statement of what is essenti to the Christian faith, and agree in substance with Mr. Snape's fuller state ment. I would go a little further than the last paragraph of Mr. Snape answer and say that the resurrection of Christ brought into existence, not vision of life's purpose, but a new kind of life, the life of the Spirit, the lif of Christ shared by the believer. This is new creation. S. H. Hooke.

QUESTION III

In the Prayer Book Version of Psalms xcvi, 10 *and xcviii,* 8 *there ar references to 'the round world.' Whence comes the conception of the worl as round? Was it a bit of Modernism on the part of the sixteenth-centur translators?*

The Hebrew *tebel,* translated by the LXX as *oikoumené,* 'the inhabite world,' and by the Vulgate as *'orbis terrarum,'* 'the circle of the lands,' is poetic synonym for *erets,* 'earth,' and has nothing in it to suggest *roundnes* whether spherical or circular. The Prayer Book Version of the Psalter wa based on the Great Bible of 1539, and this in its turn rested on Coverdale translation, behind which was Tyndale's translation from the Hebrew. Per haps the word 'round' may be due to the influence of the Vulgate, althoug the word *orbis* need not mean more than 'a circle.' The early Babylonia conception of the world was that of a flat circle surrounded by water, and th Hebrew conception, reflected in *Isaiah* xl, 22, 'who sitteth on the circle o the earth,' is probably due to Babylonian influence. But it is more likely tha the word *hūg,* rendered 'circle,' refers to the arch or vault of sky, thoug of as a solid and rounded vault upon which Yahweh had his seat. The com pass, *mehūgah,* is also mentioned in *Isaiah* xliv, 13 as part of the artificer equipment; see also *Job* xxii, 14 and *Proverbs* viii, 27. By Coverdale's time however, the modern conception of the earth as spherical had made its appear ance, and so the worthy compilers of the English Prayer Book may have ha a pleasant sense of being at least up to date, if not 'modernist,' when the used the expression 'the round world.' S. H. Hooke.

It is not surprising that the Rev. J. C. Hardwick and the Rev H. C. Snape find Professor Hooke's reply to Question III s complete and adequate that they see no need for further com ment. We would, however, remind the questioner that ancien geographers as long as two thousand five hundred years ago hel that the world was spherical, and that, with the exception of onl a few mediaeval writers, who contended that it was flat, this viev has persisted continuously to the present day.

Mr. Hardwick, Mr. Snape and Professor Hooke have touche on the most important aspects of the possible existence of Power of Evil. The periodical recrudescence of interest in this subjec from the days of savagery to the cult of Spiritualism and th

plorations of the *Society for Psychical Research* testify to its scination for minds of many types.

In Question II we have combined two questions from different estioners. The Christian Faith, in the course of a long and rich velopment, has found many and varied expressions. In them is turally reflected the mental climate of the different periods hich gave them birth. Not all of them are legitimate. There has en accretion as well as development. Perhaps it is too dogmatic lay it down that the essence lies just here or just there. The ystic, the moralist, and the Christian rationalist will be disposed stress different points. In practice the believer may be content view the world, man, and God in the light of the authentic aching of our Lord as preserved in the Synoptic Gospels, and strive to order his personal and social life in accordance with at teaching.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE FAITH OF A PSYCHOLOGIST*

In this book Dr. Brown gives us a reasoned confession of faith. He proaches the subject of religion from two points of view, that of a philo-pher and that of a practising psychologist.

> 'My own life's work, as a philosopher and psychologist at Oxford while simultaneously practising as a medical psychologist in London, has kept the philosophical problem of religious belief constantly before my eyes, and has demanded serious consideration of its theoretical validity and its practical efficacy.' (Preface.)

These two points of view are characteristic of all Dr. Brown's writings, iving them a special interest and importance. The present volume contains aterial from other books now out of print, together with much new matter, ie fruits of a further twenty years of thought and practice.

Dr. Brown's main position is that while philosophy provides sufficient asis for rational religion, psychology confirms the general conclusion of hilosophy by clinical experiment. A practising psychologist finds that his atients respond best to treatment when they have a firm faith in a wise nd good God.

> '(Faith) is the determination to trust in the good and to act upon the noblest hypothesis . . . It is "the attitude of an active will to believe, the active valuation of something as worth while, the expecting a result because it is good. It is a fundamental belief in the goodness which is at the back of things, a belief in the friendliness of the universe, that the universe is not absolutely alien to us, not hostile to us, but friendly."' (p. 174.)

It is possible to argue that faith so described is credulity, is mere wish-il thinking. But if this were so, then faith would dissolve under psycho-

* *Personality and Religion*, by William Brown, D.M. (Oxon.), D.Sc. (London), F.R.C.P. Jniversity of London Press. 9/6. 1946.)

logical treatment, just as other illusions do. 'Deep analysis' would leave the patient less religious than he was before. But this is not Dr. Brown's experience. Referring to his own analysis he writes :—

> 'The analysis had indeed a purifying effect upon my religious feelings, freeing them from much that was merely infantile and supported by sentimental associations or historical accidents. But the ultimate result has been that I have become more convinced than ever that religion is the most important thing in life, and that it is essential to mental health . . . In many patients whom I have analysed I have found a similar result. Although mere emotionalism and religiosity is diminished, the essentially religious outlook on life remains unimpaired.' (p. 134.)

This conclusion is of the greatest interest and importance. But its application to the treatment of nervous patients is difficult. In the following chapter on 'Suggestion and Faith' Dr. Brown describes the dangers of faith-healing.

> 'The process of spiritual healing is a process of arousing faith, the faith state, and that faith state may have different degrees of rationality, which is the same thing as saying that it may extend over a smaller or larger area of the self, and if it is limited to a smaller part of the self, it may mislead the individual instead of helping him. One reason why some of us are very doubtful of the wisdom of spiritual-healing services is that, for many who attend such services it is an appeal to artificial emotion and to primitive credulity. There is the tendency to intensify that hysterical condition of mind, from which many of the patients are already suffering. In some cases there may be a disappearance of hysterical symptoms and apparent cure, but only at the expense of another symptom—namely, reliance upon a quasi-miraculous possibility, the expectation of getting something for nothing, as it were, of getting direct gifts without full appreciation of corresponding demands upon personality.' (p. 143.)

These are some of the conclusions of Dr. Brown, the psychologist. As a philosopher he lays special emphasis upon values, quoting among others Kant, Hegel and Bradley. Here he is not always easy to follow, and not always convincing. We will conclude with two reflections on individuality and personality.

> 'Mere individuality which is so much a craving to be different from others and to get special advantages not shared with others is a bad thing, a regression towards a more childish outlook on life, and is not in the line of progress. (p. 188.) The more we discipline and purify ourselves, the more sincere we are with ourselves, getting away from the mere individual, the deeper will be our insight into life, and the greater our power of appreciating values.' (p. 189.)

J. K. NETTLEFOLD

MARTIN BUCER

Martin Bucer (1491-1551), who in his early manhood was converted from Papalism by Martin Luther at Wittenberg and became an influential Continental Reformer, in his later years definitely influenced the English Reformation.

A recent volume, *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation** by Con-

* *Martin Bucer and the English Reformation*, by Constantin Hopf, D.Phil. (Oxon.). (Blackwell's, Oxford. 30/-. 1947.)

antin Hopf, deals with the English period of Bucer's influence. Dr. Hopf's reatise is characterized by minute research and conscientious discrimination. f all the outstanding Continental Protestant Reformers, Bucer in his tone nd temper and in his ideals and methods is most closely akin to the greatest f our English Church Reformers Archbishop Cranmer, Dean Colet, Bishop atimer, Archbishop Parker, 'the judicious Hooker' and Bishop Cosin.

Unflinching in his devotion to the cause of moral and spiritual reforma- on, unceasing in his endeavours to promote that reformation by every means n his power, Bucer always aimed at construction rather than destruction and n maintaining continuity of Church life and order.

Many years after Bucer's death, John Milton described him as the 'Pastor f the Nations.' It was the possession of this pastoral spirit which charac- rizes Bucer's Church policy. Doubtless it was in part the product of a ery wide and profound religious experience.

Bucer entered the Dominican Order when very young and received a horough training in scholastic theology. Under the influence of Luther he nounced Papalism and, like Luther, married a nun. He held in succession any pastoral charges. He attended every important Reforming Convention n Germany. He became the right-hand man of Hermann von Wied, Arch- ishop of Cologne, and played an important part in the production of his *onsultatio*. Bucer finally settled in Strassburg and here his pastoral spirit as most in evidence. With Anabaptists as with Papalists he found it impos- ble to come to terms; but his influence became outstanding in his endeavours o harmonize the doctrinal differences and Reformation policies of Lutherans nd Zwinglians.

It might be supposed that so benign and practical a personality would ave been tolerated but it was these very qualities in his character which his pponents recognized as most dangerous, and Bucer, having refused to sign he *Interim* of 1549, had to seek refuge in exile. Cranmer, now supreme in he English Church, cordially invited him to England and secured his appoint- ent to a position of the greatest influence—Regius Professor of Divinity n the University of Cambridge. But Bucer's health was declining and the ambridge climate, which had proved too much for Erasmus, terminated the rrestrial career of Bucer within two years of his arrival in the Fen Country.

At his funeral, attended by the representatives of the University and the orporation of Cambridge, about 3,000 mourners were present. His mortal emains were buried in St. Mary the Great, but were not allowed to stay here. After Queen Mary came to the throne and the Houses of Parliament n their knees renounced the Reformation (on the clear understanding that o church property was to be restored to its original owners) Cardinal Pole, ow Archbishop of Canterbury, instituted proceedings against the deceased ucer. This Tudor predecessor of Canon Raven having been found guilty f heresy, his remains were dug up, chained to a stake in Cambridge market nd publicly burnt with his heretical writings.

On the Accession of Queen Elizabeth what remained of Bucer's bones ere recovered, we are not told how, and were re-interred in St. Mary the reat. This osseous incident has its parallel in the treatment of Mrs. Peter artyr's remains in Oxford where her husband, Bucer's contemporary, was egius Professor of Divinity.

The *First Prayer Book of King Edward VI* had been published and Bucer's pinion of it was sought by Cranmer. The results of his examination of the rayer Book are contained in a document known as the *Censura*—this title

was not given by Bucer. The document itself was not published until 1577. Bucer was favourable to much in the Prayer Book. He wrote of its Communion Service:—

> 'Concerning this [office] I give the utmost thanks to God, who has given it to be drawn up so pure, and so scrupulously faithful to the word of God, especially at [considering?] the time at which this was done. For excepting a very few words and signs I perceive nothing in it at all which may not be drawn out of the Holy Scriptures.' (p. 57).

He did not like the *Epiklesis*. On the other hand he expressed no desire to break up the Canon as was done in the *Second Prayer Book of King Edward VI*. Bucer valued very highly the Prayer of Humble Access, as expressing the true view of Christ's Presence in the Holy Communion. He makes a number of interesting suggestions for the revision of the book but they are all remarkably restrained. Some of them were adopted and incorporated into the *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI*. The wearing of vestments he regarded as a minor issue. They might be retained and worn by the clergy provided they paid no superstitious regard to them. But to sum up.

Bucer's position was mid-way between that of the First and Second Prayer Books. In his liturgical moderation he was even more English than the English. But Bucer was quite as keenly interested in ethical and political reform as he was in ecclesiastical. This comes out clearly in his *De Regno Christi,* portions of which were translated into English by John Milton where he appears as the advocate of a Christian Utopia of a most practical kind. Milton rejoiced to find in Bucer one who advocated his own views on marriage and divorce. Bucer permitted divorce in the case of adultery, desertion, incurable disease, impotency, malignant hatred and cruelty and allowed remarriage of the innocent party after a divorce for infidelity. In all this Bucer turned his back on the precepts and practice of the Papal Church.

In his proposals for the relief of the poor, Bucer advocated that different methods should be used in the case of the deserving and of the undeserving poor. He stood for the public administration of charity and was against private and indiscriminate almsgiving. In his views on usury he appears to have been in agreement with Calvin and contrary to the teaching of the Mediaeval Church, permitted the charging of reasonable interest on loans. He maintained that Scripture forbids not the charging of interest but of charging excessive interest. As a social reformer he definitely belongs to the modern world.

Bucer's moderation and courage: his loyalty to truth, combined with his endeavour to promote unity and order: his care for the welfare of men's bodies as well as their souls: his retention of traditional usage where it served a good purpose and his fearless rejection of it when it was injurious entitle him to be better known in this country than is usually the case. Luther we know, Calvin we know, Melanchthon we know, Zwingli we know, but of Bucer we are almost ignorant. Yet in his Christian understanding and outlook he seems to be nearer to the best Christian thought of to-day than are any of his Continental contemporaries.

Dr. Hopf's book is erudite and conscientious and deserves to be regarded as a standard work.

H.D.A.M.

THE UNITY OF THE BIBLE

In these stimulating Cambridge lectures* Professor Dodd adopts a standpoint which has been rather neglected of late. In the last fifty years much progress has been made in understanding the Bible through the closer and more accurate study of its individual books, with the frank acknowledgment of their differences in outlook and knowledge. Professor Dodd's purpose is to emphasize the unity of the Bible to show that, in the context in which we receive it, it brings us a single message. 'A first approach to the unity of the whole is the recognition that the different parts have their origin in the life of a community conscious of a continuous history' (p. 2). It might seem that this unity is broken where the New Testament is joined to the Old. But this is not the opinion of the New Testament writers themselves. In their belief the Christian Church is the true continuation of the Israel of the Old Testament. 'The Church conceives itself as the continuing embodiment of the historic Israel of God; and we receive the Bible from the hands of the Church' (p. 5).

> 'The Bible is the sacred book of the Christian religion . . . It is the book which the Church recommends people to read in order to know about God in His relation to man and the world, to worship Him intelligently and to understand the aim and the obligations of human life under His rule. In other words, it offers this book to us as a revelation of God' (p. 12).
>
> 'The Bible is a unity of diverse writings which together are set forth by the Church as a revelation of God in history' (p. 14).

In three most interesting lectures Professor Dodd traces this thread of unity first through the Old Testament and then through the New, the unity of a single community with a continuous history. The New Testament writers insist upon it. Abraham is 'our father,' 'our fathers passed through the Red Sea,' and so on. The Church gradually worked out a scheme of interpretation along these lines, according to which the Bible was studied for centuries. Parts of that scheme still survive in our table of lessons and in phrases of the Book of Common Prayer. They should receive more emphasis and better understanding. The scheme as taught in the Medieval Church was too narrow, and rested upon the misinterpretation of some passages of scripture. *Isaiah* vii., 10.14 ('A virgin shall conceive and bear a son') is not a suitable lesson for Christmas Day; the reference to the Flood in the prayer for fine weather is inappropriate, and the introduction of Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca into the marriage service (omitted in the Deposited Book) is unhelpful. But much of Morning and Evening Prayer must seem remote and even unintelligible without a clear understanding of the unity of the Old and New Testaments. When it is understood our worship gains immensely in interest, variety and depth.

In his concluding chapters Professor Dodd returns to his general theme, history as revelation. This phrase can have two meanings, and both are applicable to the Bible.

> 'In the changing and developing thoughts of the Biblical writers about God, man and the world, we have a movement of the spirit of man towards a fuller apprehension of the truth, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth . . . We may think of it as a process of education. God, who is the source of all truth, communicated to men, stage by stage, as they were able to digest it, an increasing measure of know-

* *The Bible To-day*, by C. H. Dodd. (C.U.P. 7/6. 1946.)

ledge about Himself. In this sense the Bible is rightly described as containing a progressive revelation.

'But this is not all. (The Bible) is also a history of events in which, and particularly in certain crucial events, we are invited to trace the manifest working of the divine providence. "The mighty acts of the Lord" is a Biblical phrase which stamps the whole. The God of the Bible is a "living God." He reveals Himself in the movement of events. What we are dealing with is not simply a history of revelation, but history as revelation' (p. 98).

The writing of history consists in the record of events and in their interpretation.

'According to the unanimous view of the Biblical writers, the meaning of the events resides in a meeting of man with God. It is this which gives character to the history . . . The course of events itself was what it was, because it bore this meaning for those who participated in it. It was because the prophets interpreted the history of their time in this sense that the history of succeeding centuries followed the course it did. And it is so all through the Old and New Testaments.

'This means that the Biblical history is controlled by a factor which is beyond history. The importance of the "natural" factors which go to make history is not ignored . . . But at the crucial points it is made clear that a factor beyond the natural is impinging upon the natural factors and directing their outcome. This "supernatural" factor cannot be explained away without rewriting the Bible and falsifying the witness of its writers. Here is the real *crux* of belief in the supernatural. Miracle-stories lie on the fringe. Discussion of them falls into place when we have settled accounts with this central feature of the whole record; an encounter with that which transcends the whole natural order of things; the meeting of man with God' (p. 99).

The Biblical writers were convinced that in the record of Israel's history the controlling hand of God could be clearly traced. And this conviction of theirs had great influence on the course of subsequent events. But was their conviction justified, was their belief true? False beliefs have influenced the course of history as well as true ones. Much depends on the method in which God is believed to have influenced human affairs. Professor Dodd finds the supernatural factor chiefly in what is implied in the Biblical phrase, 'the Word of God.'

'God makes an approach to man in a way that commands his attention and elicits a response of some kind, positive or negative. The response is not forced. Man remains free. But in proportion as he responds the Word proves a creative factor in history. As we have seen, the approach of God to men usually takes place at the point where they are keenly aware of the world-situation in which they are living. The Word of God comes, characteristically, as an interpretation of the situation, carrying with it an obligation to act. The "inspiration" of the prophets is essentially a power of insight into the situation, as expressing a meaning which is God's meaning for His people' (p. 105).

It is in the lives and teachings of the prophets, 'the peculiar glory of the religion of Israel,' that Professor Dodd chiefly finds the supernatural factor. Chiefly, but not altogether. For this method of approach is not sufficient to explain for instance the Resurrection. But even here Professor Dodd underlines the similarities between the Resurrection appearances and

ie visions of the prophets. Our only first-hand evidence in the New Tes-ament is Saint Paul's vision. "The corroborative evidence . . . that the omb where Jesus was buried was untenanted is secondary . . . If you could rove that the tomb was empty, you would still be far from establishing ie apostolic faith that 'Christ was raised at the right hand of God'" (p. 164).

'The Word of God, then, is the supra-historical factor which we have noted as entering into the course of history and directing it. It came, not as a mere "inner Light," but as the interpretation of a situation, requiring action in that situation. Over against the evil in the situation, it came as judgment; for through the Word of God the disasters which are the necessary consequences of persistent wrong-doing are understood as His judgment upon sin. It came also through the response of those who heard it, as a word of rescue and renewal. Thus the pattern of history as a divinely directed process was established' (p. 105).

But the pattern is not complete, for the course of events does not conform o it entirely. Therefore human history itself is put into a supernatural ramework. It begins with the creation of the world by God; it ends with God's judgment upon all mankind. Professor Dodd has outlined a Christian hilosophy of history. But in the modern world there are rival philosophies, he Nazi creed and Marxism. We have to judge between them. Which hilosophy helps us most to understand the course of events and to find our lace in contemporary history? Professor Dodd reminds us that we shall e most likely to find the answer if we look for it as members of the hristian Church.

'Through seeing the process at work in a concrete institution we understand how contemporary history falls into the context of the history which is revelation . . . The Bible deals all through with the conception of a *people* of God, which is the point of application of God's creative Word, and the place where history is made through man's response to it. Read in the light of that conception, and in the context of an actual community playing its part in the drama of our time, it becomes acutely relevant to our contemporary problem' (p. 142).

J. K. NETTLEFOLD

DR. GLASSON AND THE 'PAROUSIA'*

At the Cambridge Church Congress of 1910 the most important theme iscussed was Dr. Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede,* which had recently een translated into English with the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus.* his book, as brilliant as it was revolutionary, attacked and rejected on the ne hand the Jesus of Catholic dogma and on the other hand the humanitarian thical Jesus of German Liberal Protestantism. Now, Schweitzer denied that esus was the Messiah but held him to be his forerunner; a second John the Baptist. Yet He possessed a Messianic consciousness, but in this he was deluded and died in despair upon the Cross. There was indeed a Kingdom of God coming, as the Synoptic writers said, but Jesus had no part in founding t. The ethic of Jesus was simply intended for practice in the brief interval efore the Son of Man came. It was not, as the liberals believed it to be, he ethic of a world-wide evolutionary and permanent civilization.

'If Schweitzer's portrait of Jesus, and his reconstruction of the processes of his consciousness was right, then the whole of Christendom was wrong and had always been wrong.'

* *The Second Advent*: The Origin of the New Testament Doctrine, by T. Francis Glasson. Epworth Press. 12/6. 1945.)

These are the words of Canon Lloyd cited from his recent volume, *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century* (p. 73).

Although English Modernists possessed a high personal regard for Schweitzer, they were much divided as to how far it was possible to accept his critical conclusions. Sanday welcomed his volume, but three years later publicly expressed his conviction that his welcome had been too generous. Burkitt also warmly welcomed Schweitzer's attack on the German Liberal Christian Jesus. Archdeacon Charles thought Schweitzer too 'cocksure.' Dean Inge declared that he had kicked the bottom out of the bucket of Christianity. Schweitzer's brilliant gifts, his devoted missionary labours, won universal regard even from those unable to accept his critical conclusions. It is all nearly half a century ago, and to-day New Testament critical scholarship has retreated steadily from Schweitzer's extreme position. Dr. Glasson's volume *The Second Advent* has, as the result of its critical research, come to conclusions much closer to those of Harnacks *Wesen Des Christentums* than those of Schweitzer's *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*.

Dr. Glasson's book, for which he was granted the doctorate of divinity in the University of London is erudite and critical in its contents and methods, but is very readable in style. Dr. Glasson's conclusion may be very briefly summarized as follows: that Christian faith in the Second Advent is not derived from the actual teaching of Jesus Himself, nor is it derived from Judaism, but is the product of the faith of the primitive Christian Church as expressed in the concluding words of the *Apocalypse*: 'Behold, I come quickly. Even so come Lord Jesus.'

Dr. Glasson's point of view is clearly set forth in the following citations from his Introduction.

> 'In his *Collected Essays,* T. H. Huxley refers to the view that Jesus foretold His speedy return to the earth in glory, and makes the comment: "If he believed and taught that, then assuredly he was under an illusion, and he is responsible for that which the mere effluxion of time has demonstrated to be a prodigious error."
>
> 'Every New Testament writer refers to the doctrine of the Second Advent, or the *Parousia,* to give it its technical name, but a fixed point in our inquiry is provided by the letters of St. Paul to the *Thessalonians* . . . These two letters also provide us with the fullest description of the Parousia to be found in the New Testament:
>
> > For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of an archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words (I *Thessalonians* iv. 15-18).
>
> This is what the Church believed about the year A.D. 50. We are to inquire into the question: How did this belief arise? Did the Church derive it from the teaching of Jesus? If so, how did He in turn arrive at this conviction?
>
> 'The usual answer is that Jesus Himself taught the doctrine of his return in glory, and while some maintain that He set no time for this event, others ascribe to Him the view which Huxley found so erroneous. . . .

'In the present work the pre-supposition that the *Parousia* was a popular dogma of Jesus' time is first examined. A discussion of the teaching of Jesus on the subject follows. Then comes an examination of the beliefs of the early Church, and an answer to the original question is submitted. Part Four, on later Jewish teaching, is added to round off the main argument.'

In the purely critical point of view Dr. Glasson's examination of *Enoch*, interpretation, citation, and influence is of outstanding value. No student the eschatological problem can afford to neglect this most valuable and, appears to us, decisive contribution to the solution of the problem. At same time Dr. Glasson's statements concerning the relation of *Daniel* to *ch* are not entirely consistent.

It is interesting to observe that Streeter's criticism of Schweitzer's conons based on Streeter's own critical studies of the sources of the Synoptic bels stands unshaken.

We conclude our brief notice of this important volume with two citations ch have their bearing on the relation of the Christian religion to modern ization.

Dr. Glasson asks:

'If the doctrine [of the Second Advent] was not a part of Jesus' message and arose in the way indicated, the question arises: What then is to be the future destiny of the human race?'

Dr. Glasson answers it thus:

'Clement of Alexandria struck the authentic Christian note when he said that Jesus turned sunset into sunrise.' (p. 232.)

H.D.A.M.

THE INCARNATION *

The doctrine of the Incarnation involves two interdependent articles of f, namely that 'The Word was God' and 'The Word was made flesh.' Mascall gives the content of the doctrine in the following words: 'The ne Word or Son of God united to himself in the womb of Mary a comde human nature, complete in both body and soul.' This happening was a case of the production of a new person, but of the assumption of a nature by a person who already existed—the pre-existent Logos 'took nature upon him, and was made Man.'

The theory is clear enough, but the difficulty is to see how such a thing d possibly happen. The *Quicunque vult* explains it by the parallel union body and soul in man. 'As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, God and Man is one Christ.' As Mr. Mascall points out, the one is really difficult to explain as the other; thus the Creed explains the inexplicable the inexplicable; though, to be sure, the one 'incomprehensible' *is* a ter of experience.

But *is* it a matter of experience that body and mind (or soul) are two? t not a matter of interpretation—and mistaken interpretation at that? not 'body' and 'mind' alike abstractions? If so, the mystery of their on is the product of a fallacy, the mystery is of our own making. We de a whole into two and ask however the two halves came together.

But accepting the doctrine as stated, the question then arises whether Word being made flesh is not incompatible with the infinity and (still e) the immutability and impassibility of God? Mr. Mascall is quite clear this point.

* *Christ, the Christian and the Church*, by E. L. Mascall. (Longmans. 15/-.)

> 'It must be said quite plainly that neither the Incarnation nor a thing else can involve any change in God himself. God is altogeth immutable and impassible.'

Of course the trouble is that a dogma like this cannot be checked experience; we simply have to take the theologian's word for it, though seems to go against common sense. Indeed, Mr. Mascall has to join iss here with such authorities as the Dean of St. Paul's and Dr. Relton, a quotes as relevant the *Quicunque vult,* which lays it down that Christ is c 'not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the manho into God,' which suggests that any change involved is in the human a not in the divine nature. But is the taking up of human nature into divine nature what is usually meant by the Incarnation? Was it not Word that was made flesh, and not flesh incorporated into the Word?

Yet Mr. Mascall's comment here is apposite enough. He says that ma current discussions of Christology

> 'take as their starting-point human nature as it is known to us, a then in effect inquire what must happen to the divine Word if he is be compressed within its limits; they hardly ever start by consideri the mode of existence of the divine Word and then ask what must ha pen to human nature if it is to be united to him.'

One imagines that the reason for this is that while we do know somethi about human nature from common experience, we can know nothing experience of the nature of the divine Word not yet incarnate.

What is known as the 'Kenotic theory' associated chiefly with the na of Bishop Gore, is an attempt to explain what limitations were involved the taking on of human nature by the divine Word. Examining this the Mr. Mascall rightly points out that sound exegetical authorities can quoted against the view that the word 'emptied' implies that the divi Word stripped himself of elements proper to his divinity. The reference m rather be to the Suffering Servant who 'poured out his soul unto death.' a matter of fact the 'classical' interpretation of *Philippians* ii, 5ff. is e tremely doubtful, as has been pointed out by Professor Lake, and recen again by Mr. L. B. Cross. The contrast is between the First Adam and t Second Adam, both made in the likeness of God, but whereas the form desired to be 'as God,' the latter did not deem this a 'thing to be grasp at,' thus reversing the behaviour of Adam, and thereby restoring fall humanity to its original state. 'There was no question of incarnation, G taking our nature upon him; it was the reverse which was required, th fallen human nature should again take on the nature of God.'

The doctrine of the two natures in Christ, perfect God and perfect Ma as defined at Chalcedon, has always been a matter of great difficulty, whi is not always eased by calling it a mystery incomprehensible to man. D Relton has pronounced it a logical impossibility, while Dr. William Temp declared the formula to be a confession of the bankruptcy of Greek Patris theology. Mr. Mascall does not agree with these strictures. His expositi of the doctrine is as follows:

> 'In the incarnate Lord two natures, a divine and a human, are separably and unconfusedly united in one divine Person. We must r recognize that the two natures are not both related to the Perso precisely the same way. The Person of the Word and his divine natu are, in the scholastic phrase, really identical and only logically distin . . . The divine Person and the human nature, on the other hand, though they are united to each other in the most intimate way . .

are not absolutely identical. The divine nature belongs to the Word from all eternity . . . while his human nature was taken by him at a particular moment in the world's history . . . He *became man*; he never 'became God'.'

Mr. Mascall suggests that the attempt to remove Christological speculation from the ontological sphere, where it properly belongs, to the psychological sphere (as was advocated originally by the first Archbishop Temple), has been unfortunate. The speculations of Chalcedon really belong to the department of metaphysics, and are concerned with 'being' in the abstract. The trouble is that the modern mind, trained in the natural sciences, or at least respecting them, has little interest in, or understanding of, the essence of things, or being in the abstract. If it is to understand the doctrine of the Incarnation it must try to explain it in terms of contemporary psychology (perhaps introducing, as Professor Sanday did, the nation of the subconscious. But nevertheless

'the doctrine of the Incarnation is not itself a matter of psychology, and thus any attempt to identify, for example, "person" with "consciousness" or with "personality" (in the commonly accepted modern sense of that term) can lead to nothing but confusion.'

One weakness of some modern Christological writing (in Mr. Mascall's view) is a reluctance to discuss the subject in its proper terms, and an anxiety to transpose it into the more fashionable science of psychology—due to a failure of theological nerve—another weakness may be an undue eagerness to make concessions to the prejudices of the contemporary mind. And yet, of course, if the doctrine is to be commended to the modern mind the prejudices cannot be altogether ignored.

Mr. Mascall expounds the doctrine of the Incarnation

'as being the re-creation of human nature by its elevation into union with the pre-existent Son and Word of God.'

And he holds it of the greatest importance to maintain that the Incarnation 'took place' not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking up of manhood into God.' In his view this doctrine is the 'essential foundation of the life of the Christian.' This interpretation of the doctrine renders it primarily soteriological.

Mr. Mascall's work is that of an accomplished scholar and a clear thinker, and it seems to emphasize the gulf which exists between the modern mind and the minds of those who were responsible for composing our creeds and elaborating our orthodox theology. The ancients were interested in ontology, dealt with problems of 'being' in the abstract. The moderns, on the other hand, are interested primarily in experience and the analysis of it. Their difficulty, so far as the orthodox theology is concerned is that it seems to them to be based on *a priori* presupposition, the truth of which cannot be checked by experience. The 'facts' or 'truths' of the theologian seem to them to lie outside experience. How, for instance, can one know anything about the nature of the pre-existent Word? Thus theology seems to the contemporary inquirer to be based on surmise—and improbable surmise at that. Whether there is any way out of this difficulty is a question that can hardly be tackled here. But Mr. Mascall's book is worth careful study by those who wish to have a clear exposition of the traditional theology. There is so much muddleheaded thinking about these matters that any clear and consistent statement of a position is a help, and not least if you happen to want to criticize it.

J. C. Hardwick.

A CREED FOR FREE MEN*

Whether Democracy can survive will chiefly depend upon the intellect and moral level attained by the average democrat. Ideally, of course, Dem racy and Aristocracy would be one and the same thing and such an id can only be approached by a continual heightening of the standards a outlook of the general public. But unless this is done there is always danger that Democracy will discredit itself by degenerating into mere m rule and anarchy. It is well that this inherent weakness of Democra should be realized since the virtue of popular government is often suppo to be self evident. In fact it is not self evident. Popular government, e to the extent of universal suffrage, can have no justification if the popu mentality is not of a reasonably high order.

There is no need to point out that whatever is without justification m inevitably lack both security and stability, and although the course of war has freed Democracy from immediate danger, it can have no perman safety without the above-mentioned conditions being fulfilled. What needed, therefore, is the promotion of an intelligent study of Democra For this purpose *A Creed for Free Men* by Dr. Adams Brown will prov an excellent starting point for such a study. Although first published in t country three years ago, it has gained rather than lost in relevance by t lapse of time, since today our problem is not the overthrow of dictatorsh but the rebuilding of Democracy.

Dr. Adams Brown points out that any system of government, even t of a dictator cannot rely upon force alone. It has to make its behests se *reasonable* and therefore it must have some philosophy of life as its bas 'The fundamental basis of democratic society, is respect for human pers ality' (p. 18). But this of itself is not enough in view of the difficulties a dangers by which Democracy is beset. For instance, the motives to wh it may appeal are not nearly so obvious as those by which the dictator rou his adherents:—

> 'National honour, [i.e. in the sense of "prestige"] economic curity, selfishness, fear: these are powerful motives indeed. Agai these the democrat can only oppose the enduring human virtues up which all lasting social order depends: man's love of freedom, his se of justice, his need of a stable social order' (p. 38).

Hence it is necessary, if democratic principles are to be made secure, t these virtues should be seen to be more than merely human virtues. T must be based upon convictions that only religion can supply.

> 'The central conviction which is common to all forms of vital religi is that the values which man esteems most highly are not his alo They are rooted in transcendent reality, above and beyond the best t man is or can become. The name religious people give to this tra cendent reality is God' (p. 51).

Again, Democracy has to justify its faith in the common man, against opposite view that the common man must always be the object of distrust a contempt. How is it to do so?

> 'Faith, if it is to survive, must be rooted in reality. If you wo convince a man that he must believe in his neighbour, you must sh him that there is something in the neighbour to believe in. If you wo

* *A Creed for Free Men: A Study of Loyalties,* by William Adams Brown. (S.C Press. 5/-. 1942.)

ersuade him to serve his neighbour, you must show him that there is mething in his neighbour to justify sacrifice.

'Here religion comes to our aid. What humanism lacks, Christian ith supplies — the dynamic which makes it possible to believe that ose who have broken faith with us may become trustworthy, and those ho seem to us unlovely may develop unsuspected graces. We should elieve in our neighbour, Jesus tells us, because God sees in him some- ing we do not see. We should love him because God finds something him to love' (p. 73).

ove all the *leaders* of Democracy must have this faith in transcendent , in God who is our Father in heaven:

'Since the end they seek is . . . a fellowship of men of all races and ations and classes for the common good, they must believe that such a llowship is possible, and this means that they must believe that the al to which they have consecrated their life is the expression of a rpose which is regnant in the universe. Their faith in the men who ust be their helpers . . . must root in faith in God who is able to make em fellow-workers with Himself for the better society which is in the aking' (pp. 89-90).

t if Democracy is thus to be inspired and safeguarded by belief in that belief will require an organized embodiment. In other words the ian Church will have its part to play in democratic society.

'While the separate states are working out the difficult experiment f world government it is essential that there should be a society of men hat transcends all political boundaries, that is committed to no political rogramme, that embraces men of widely different views, united only y their common faith in the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of an, and the fellowship of service. *Such a society the Church aspires to e, and there is no other.* Alone among human institutions the Church as taken the ideal of a world society seriously. Only the Church there- ore provides the foundation on which such a society can be based' . 98)

ow is the Church to play its part, and what kind of a Church will it o be? On both these subjects Dr. Adams Brown has some wise things . It must play its part by witnessing to:—

'The realities . . . the undying convictions which, if sincerely ccepted and loyally followed, would provide the spiritual basis that emocracy so sorely needs . . . They are such as these:

1. That there is a righteous and loving God who sets the standard or His creatures and who is revealing Himself to them as their Father.

2. That each human personality has inherent value as a being made h the image of God, free and responsible and hence capable either of ood or of evil.

3. That no man is complete in himself, but realizes his full person- lity only through fellowship.

4. That all men have sinned and need salvation.

5. That God has given Jesus Christ to be the Saviour from sin and he type to which all men must seek to conform.

6. That the way to appropriate this divine gift is through faith that orks by love.

'These are convictions held in common by all Christians and by any other faiths as well. From these convictions certain consequences ollow which give direction to the individual life and set the goal for ocial effort. They are these:

1. That a man should love God with all his heart and soul a strength, and therefore

2. That he should love his neighbour as himself.

3. That the end to which all men should consecrate their lives a through which only they can realize their true fellowship is the socie of free men living in faith and love, which Jesus called the Kingdo of God.

4. That the agent which God has chosen to prepare the way for t society in His Church, not the imperfect approximation of that Chur which we see in the existing churches but the company of men a women who have seen the vision and in humility and thankfulness a giving their lives to what they see.

5. That the standard by which success in every specific form human activity is to be judged, whether it be political, economic, ed cational or religious, is loyalty to this fellowship.

'A Church which will put these convictions at the heart of its me sage will help the democracies to recover the unifying faith which is th supreme need to-day' (pp. 102-103).

To this all Modern Churchmen will gladly reply 'Amen!' But where such a Church to be found as Democracy requires? Nevertheless, Dr. Adam Brown bids us be charitable and remember:—

'The Church is not a little island of saints lifted above the oce of our common humanity. It is itself a cross-section of that humanit It differs from other institutions of similar membership and simil limitations only in its witness to a world wide brotherhood, and its fai that it is God's purpose to make that brotherhood real' (p. 104).

But he continues:

'The point where the Churches are failing, and the one point whe their failure is most disastrous, is that they are not putting this witne in the central place it deserves and making this faith normative for their activities' (p. 104).

Obviously the Church that is needed must be united much more close than it is to-day. But

Dr. Adams Brown reminds us that 'unity, like freedom is an ambig ous word. It may become the instrument of evil as well as of goo The totalitarian states make unity their ideal, but it is a unity whi involves the destruction of freedom. So there are ideals of Chur unity which are equally destructive of liberty. Much of the demand f organic union is based upon the assumption that there is one particul form of organization which is God's will for His Church, that we kno what that organization is, and that there can be no true fellowship wi those who reject this ideal and substitute one of a different kind.

'Such a conception of unity makes impossible the only kind Church that can give the world what it most needs to-day — a socie that can unite free men in the on going experiment of democrac (p. 105).

If all Christians could share Dr. Adams Brown's vision and apprecia the virtue of Christian democracy; and similarly, if all democrats could s that their ideals can only possess reality if they are founded upon a spiritu basis — and more especially upon a Christian basis — ; our hopes for a ne world would be assured.

D. L. Scott.

DID JESUS AT HIS BAPTISM FORESEE HIS PASSION?

he Intention of Jesus, as your reviewer* rightly says, is an important in general convincing argument that, in spite of the many attempts various sides to disprove it, the conception of the purpose and mission sus, as the Church has conceived it, is substantially correct, and is ed from Jesus Himself. If therefore I venture to dispute one point which Professor Bowman lays repeated stress, it is not to be under- that I disagree with his general conclusions, except on that point.

Professor Bowman repeatedly says that the words heard by Jesus at His sm, 'Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased,' taken as are from *Psalm* ii, 7, and from *Isaiah* xlii, 1, prove that from the first Lord united into one the conception of the Messiah (understood as the of Man in *Daniel* vii, 13) with the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, hat therefore from the first He foresaw His rejection and the Cross. irst point is simply this, that it is a perilous inference to conclude that item in the conception of the Suffering Servant of Jahweh given in ne four Servant Songs,† was present to the mind of Jesus, because a words from the first of them came to Him at the critical point of the ation of His call. Many other readers of Professor Bowman's book probably agree with me so far. They will agree with him in part if he says, namely that the opening verses of *Isaiah* xlii, and perhaps them the similar verses in *Isaiah* xlix were present to the mind of . And that therefore we are abundantly justified in believing that from irst the content of His Messianic consciousness was that He was to revealing, light-bringing and saving Messiah, not to Israel only, but l mankind. And I would add that this form of Messiahship must have t first converting Israel to His understanding of the nature of the dom of God, and then leading them in a Mission to the rest of the . An expectation which is impossible to reconcile with what actually ened, His rejection and death at the instigation of his own people.

I

he second point which Professor Bowman seems to have entirely over- d is that there is a mass of evidence in the Synoptic Gospels, which s to the positive conclusion that the suffering of the Servant was *not* the first in the mind of Jesus. This appears in each of the three most le sources of the Synoptic Gospels, *Mark,* Q, and L, and it shows Jesus had in the early days of His Mission expected to win a response the Jewish people, and was deeply disappointed that He had failed, ther that they had failed Him.

et us take Mark first. Can the words in the parable of the Wicked bandmen (*Mk.* xii), 'They will reverence my Son,' have any real mean- t all, unless Jesus had at one time hoped to win the Jewish people? ssume, as many have assumed, that He knew from the first that they d not accept Him, is to rob the words of reality.

ext there are two in Q. The upbraiding of the Cities in which He had ched, because they had not repented (*Lk.* x, 13-16, and *Matt.* xi, 21-24) the Lament over Jerusalem, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem' (*Lk.* xiii, 34-35, *Matt.* xxiii, 37-39).

hen in L. we have the other Lament over Jerusalem, 'If thou hadst

*The review of Professor Bowman's book to which Mr. Wilson refers was published in st issue of January 1947, pp. 368-372. The reviewer was Rev. D. L. Scott.

†The four Servant Songs are *Isaiah* xlii, 1-4; xlix, 1-6; l, 4-9; and lii, 13–liii, 12. (See er's *Isaiah,* Vol. II (Cambridge University Press), but many other parts of *Isaiah* xl–lxvi their influence.)

known' (*Lk.* xix, 41-44) and the sorrowful words on the way to Calva addressed to the 'Daughters of Jerusalem' (*Lk.* xxiii, 28-31). I do n see how anyone could carefully read all the foregoing, considering how ea shows real and surprised disappointment, and not also realize that Jes had not set out on His Mission with the Cross before Him, but with hop of winning His people; and that His rejection came as an almost ove whelming disappointment. A disappointment, be it noted, not of prid nor even with a vestige of self-regard, but for their failure, and its resul in delay of the purposes of God.

Professor Bowman, it would seem, can never have had his attenti drawn to the implication of these passages. I think many theologians a New Testament scholars have not faced it. So far as I know the earlie note of their implication was offered by Dr. A. T. Cadoux in the *Lord Life* (1929). Dr. C. J. Cadoux, in *The Historic Mission of Jesus* (194 drew attention to it, citing all these passages. And Dr. Roderic Dunkerl has had two articles in the *Expository Times* (July, 1946, and Februar 1947), and promises at least one more, pointing out not only the implic tion of these passages but adducing many more in confirmation. It is i possible in face of all this evidence any longer to assert that the Gospe show Jesus facing the Cross from the first. Professor Bowman has be betrayed into too strong a statement by not noting the implication these passages.

II

To go back to the Servant Songs. I pointed out that because the wor of one of these Songs came to Jesus with Divine power at His Baptis it does not necessarily follow that the whole of all of them were in H Mind and accepted as indicating His Messianic work. It must now pointed out that there are very good grounds why He should not from t first have accepted the Suffering role of the Servant. There is no menti of Suffering in the first and second of the Servant Songs. That appea first in the third song and dominates the fourth. What is comm to all the songs is that the work of the Servant is both to unite Isra in the Service of Jahweh and also to bring the Gentiles into His servic But there is a noteworthy fact which seems to have received little attentio The whole of Songs I and II speak of a purpose set before the Servan *which he is to achieve in the future.* And the same is true of all the refe ences to what the Servant is to achieve in Song IV (achievement is most to be inferred in III). The achievement, the gathering of Israel a the influence upon the Gentiles are all future. But the Prophet, *while looks forward to the achievement, looks back upon the suffering. It past, though its results are future.* They are still to come. Thus the gre passage *Isaiah* lii, 13—liii, 12, sets forth the achievement and the Sufferin of the Servant roughly speaking alternately. *But always refers to t achievement as still to come, and to the suffering as something that is pas* The passage begins with the exaltation of the Servant, which is still come, refers back to his visage being marred more than any man. Th turns again to the result in bringing the Gentiles to God, 'So shall sprinkle many nations.' Then follows Chapter liii which is almo wholly occupied with the sufferings of the Servant, all spoken of as thou they had already happened, until the tenth verse, when the note of triumph and achievement again appears, as something that must come in the futu as a result of the sufferings which are already past. 'He shall see h seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosp in his hand,' and so on in the future, until the last sentence returns to t pouring out the soul to death, which is past.

Now if we must believe (as I think we all do) that it was at the Baptism
at Jesus first realized that He was to be the Agent of God in carrying out
s purpose of World Salvation, the purpose that underlay the two thousand
ars of Divine preparation, which began with the call of Abraham, in
ose seed all the nations of the earth were to be blessed (*Gen.* xxii, 18),
must make the assumption that His own inner experience of God as
ther, as well as Creator, had already led Him to the conclusion that the
ngdom of God was not an exclusive privilege of the Jewish people, but
at their Divine Discipline (to use the late Dr. Buchannan Gray's word)
s intended to fit them to be the messengers of God to all men, and that
erefore the Messiah must be rather the leader in this mission than the
nder of a Jewish empire, based on conquest and domination. Under
ese circumstances the words of *Isaiah* xlii and xlix would immediately
cur to him as a prophetic forecast of what was to be done when the time
as ripe.

The words of His first proclamation in *Mark* i, 15, which we may reasonly translate 'the opportunity is complete,' show that Jesus recognized at the world then was, as never before, ready for the true Mission of rael. There only remained the question, who is to be the leader, the Mesah? That was answered in the Divine voice at the Baptism. This is very uch what Professor Bowman says. But he goes beyond the evidence when assumes that such an inner preparation and deep understanding of the purse of God for the salvation of the nations through the ministry of Israel, cessarily pointed to the Cross. The Cross could only come if the message ere refused. And there is no suggestion in any of the Songs that the essage would not be accepted. The Sufferings of the Servant are not in em represented as falling upon him because either Israel as a whole would fuse to work with him, or the nations would turn against him. The fferings had already taken place before the Servant felt his call to his ission. And in *Isaiah* liii they are represented as something that mysriously prepared him for the work, *before he himself was aware that it as to be laid upon him.* (I here assume that the Servant generally is Israel general, or the Righteous Remnant, though perhaps, as some think, the ophet Jeremiah is in mind in *Isaiah* liii.) There then was, I submit, no round whatever why Jesus should regard the suffering part of the Servant ongs as something still to be fulfilled. It had already happened. The ission of the Servant was first to awaken Israel to the reality of its own ivileges, and then to lead them in the sharing of those privileges with e rest of the world. Again to refer back to the first proclamation by sus, the Kingdom of God was Good News. It would therefore presumply be welcomed; not rejected.

III

The Good News was rejected, but rejected not by the Gentiles who ere its remoter recipients, but by the Jews, who were to have been assoated with (or included in) the Servant. And it was rejected precisely by ose parties amongst the Jews who maintained the exclusive privileges of rael; Priests, Scribes and Pharisees. It was rejected by the central and iginating sin of human beings; pride, egotism, self-centredness. But, as e have seen, Jesus did not expect its rejection at the beginning of His inistry. His disappointment apparent in the passages already referred is evidence for that.

Two more passages may be adduced which strongly point in the same rection. The account of the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane is diffiult to account for on the ordinary supposition that the Death on the Cross

was foreseen by Him from the first as an essential part of His Mission. If He had from the day of His Baptism realized that His own death was a necessary and essential part of the work to which he was called, shrinking of the flesh and agony of the spirit would indeed be natural, and perhaps inevitable, but not the thrice-repeated prayer, 'remove this cup from me'; for those words imply that He was not absolutely certain that suffering and death were part of God's will for Him. Had He from the Baptism onward taken the whole of the Servant Songs as applying to Himself and to His work, He would from the first have schooled himself to face the death of the Cross, knowing that it was an essential part of His work; and in that case his whole prayer would have been on the lines of the second petition, 'Thy will be done.' But the fact that the two are combined seems to me conclusively to prove that it was in the first place circumstances, the fact that after some signs of apparent success it became more and more certain that the most influential part of the Jewish people were becoming His enemies, which compelled Him to see that death at the instigation of the Jewish leaders lay before Him and could not be avoided, unless He gave up His Mission. And that then, and only then, the words of the later Servant Songs came to Him as confirmation. The sufferings of the Servant in the past had to be repeated, because neither Israel as a whole, nor some substantial Remnant, was ready to be the Light-bringing Servant to the Nations.

Thus the Agony was not only, or chiefly, Agony in anticipation of His coming sufferings. It was the agony of frustration and failure. It was frustration of His plans and of God's purposes by the very people who for two thousand years had been educated by God for the very purpose of being His messengers to the rest of mankind. Had they accepted him, had they risen to the call no longer to separate themselves from the nations, no longer to hate their oppressors, but to carry to them the Message that the Creator of all is the Father of all, and that therefore the true life of all men is in trusting, obeying and relying upon Him, and caring for one another (the Message of the Sermon on the Mount), there would, because of the union of the then known world under Roman law and Greek language and thinking, have been a very swift advance to the Kingdom of God on Earth. But they had refused the call and rejected the Messenger.

Had then his work utterly failed? Certainly Israel had failed. God's people had turned their back on God as, according to the testimony of the prophets, they had repeatedly done in the past. Well then, the Righteous Remnant was reduced to Him alone. The Servant of Jahweh instead of being Israel was one Israelite, 'despised and rejected of men.' But the despisers and rejectors were the very men who ought to have stood by Him and worked with Him. Even when Jesus saw that He must suffer, because otherwise He too would be giving up His message and thereby turning His back on God, and even when He had decided that whatever happened He could not do that, the whole outlook must have been dark in the extreme. If the Jews could not be won, could anyone? The way of return to God for the whole world was much more difficult, much longer, much fuller of setbacks and frustrations than it ought to have been. If the sin of the Jews, their settled determination to regard themselves as the favourites of the Creator, instead of as His missionaries, was so great, what a mass of self-centredness must separate the rest of mankind from God!

All this in the last months, since sometime perhaps only a little time before Peter's Confession, must have been weighing on the mind of Jesus, and in the Agony in the Garden we can see how it issued in two apparently opposite mental attitudes, 'Remove this cup from me' and 'Thy will be

e.' But these attitudes are only contradictory of one another if we ume what the evidence already adduced shows to be untrue, that Jesus w from the Baptism onward that the Cross lay before Him. If on the er hand He had felt certain that His Mission was to lead the Jewish ple to be a Light to Lighten the Gentiles, and that, because it was His nely appointed Mission, it must succeed, there is no contradiction at The prayer 'Remove this cup' would be a petition for the fulfilment what from the first had been Jesus' conviction of the will of God. The y will be done' could, after it became certain that the cup could not removed, only mean that the Jews, having refused to co-operate with the of God, the Almighty Himself accepted the result of their refusal, bore in former times their opposition, and through His representative, Jesus, ered at their hands. The will of God in the first instance had been the Jewish people should be His missionaries to the rest of mankind. they would not accept that task, and determined the death of their ointed leader, it became God's will that even through, and by means that death, the world redemption, which had always been the Divine pose, should be brought about. God in the death of Christ, as it were, ved to the will of men, and let them do their worst in order that through r worst His unconquerable love might be seen even more convincingly uffering than it had been visible in word and life.

IV

The other confirmatory passage is that which tells of the cry of derelic- from the Cross, in *Mark* xv, 34: 'My God, my God, why hast thou saken me?' It is beyond the scope of this paper, as it is beyond the ity of the writer, to attempt any full explanation of this cry. But the ef, which used to be regarded as orthodox, that God had really forsaken beloved Son, Who was now entering upon an experience of the torments the damned, must be ruled out as impossible. The Father could not t His Son so. Even the Patripassianism of Praxeas, who is said to have med that the Father was crucified, is spiritually nearer the truth than t. Whatever it may mean, the meaning must lie in the same direction that already suggested for the Agony in the Garden. Must not the fact His rejection by the Chosen People, and the inevitable frustration of l's purposes, which that involved, have weighed upon Jesus in those rs of Agony, and that to such an extent that thereby, through the very issingness of this sorrow, combined with physical and mental exhaustion, some moments the sense of the Divine presence, which had been His tinuous experience, was blotted out, and He seemed to be deserted by d, as well as by man? And could this have happened if He had known m the very first that that rejection by His people and the cross was all ecessary and God-ordained part of the Divine purpose? If on the other d it was by the observed fact of growing opposition and by that alone t He had been led, perhaps hesitatingly and tentatively, to apply the fering role of the Servant to himself, and yet still with a hope that in ne way, even at the eleventh hour, Israel might be won over to Him, t not just what might be expected?

Here again therefore we get a confirmation of the thesis of this paper, t the commission which Jesus received in Baptism was indeed to fulfil prophetic call to be the Servant of the Lord to bring the Light of the true d to all men, but that the suffering of the servant was not part of the ginal commission as Jesus conceived it, but came to him through his perience of rejection.

May I in conclusion briefly summarize the argument?

It is not a valid logical argument that because Jesus applied the word of the first of the Servant Songs to His own Mission, He therefore applied them all. It may be so; and it equally well may not be so. Further investigation is needed, the results of which are:—

That there are a number of passages in the Synoptic Gospels, from a three of the most reliable sources, which at least point very strongly to the reverse conclusion. I would myself say, prove it.

That on examination of the whole four Servant Songs there appears very good ground why He should not have applied to Himself the later ones, for they speak of the suffering of the Servant as already past, whereas all the words about His achievements are future.

Finally that two otherwise very difficult passages are at least understandable, if we assume that at Baptism He knew Himself called to complete God's work in uniting Israel in His service, and then with them to bring the Gentiles to the service of the one God, the Creator and Father.

These conclusions may be disturbing to many people. They suggest modifications in the doctrine of the Atonement and modifications in the doctrine of Divine providence. But what I have pointed out are facts, and facts must not be made to fit theories but theories must be susceptible of modification by facts.

WILLIAM E. WILSON

A PSYCHOLOGICAL PLEA FOR HUMANISM *

We are living in a day of psychological interest and moral unrest, and each is a sign of growth, for, from whatever angle we view the contemporary scene, the thoughtful person in the end finds himself echoing David Hume's words, 'Man's chief object of study is man.' Now to aid us in such a study comes Professor Flugel's psycho-analytical work, and from its own angle it is worthy of a place beside that of Sherrington, Berdyaev and Carrel. It is an important contribution to serious thinking on the fundamental issue of our day: it will clarify our slipshod thinking, and make us ashamed of careless speech, which becomes more glib and sanctimonious as it becomes more dogmatic. This book should be made compulsory reading for statesmen and politicians, teachers and ministers of religion, for all who have to deal with young and old and who desire to be in all their contacts intelligent and effective. Nothing is easier than to make high-sounding moral appeals, especially in the right atmosphere and surroundings, but their general lack of success and permanent effects inevitably raises the question whether those who make such appeals know anything about the origin and nature of the moral impulses. To those who desire to learn the conclusions of workers in the psycho-analytical field with regard to the bearings of their study of the psychology of moral motives upon the ethical problems of today this book will enlighten their minds, and at least enable them to understand the dissatisfaction with accepted notions which calls for a revision of theory and practice inherited unthinkingly from the past.

Professor Flugel admits the fear in some quarters of the influence of psycho-analysis in the realm of values, and the attempt to show up its practitioners as meddlesome intruders in matters with which they are incompetent to deal. They are told that their business is simply to classify and describe without passing judgment on the desirability or undesirability of their findings. But values happen to be facts of mental life and cannot be separated as parts or aspects from the mental life which the psychologist studies. Psychology is indeed becoming increasingly an applied science which

* *Man, Morals and Society: A Psycho-Analytical Study*, by J. C. Flugel, B.A., D.Sc. (Duckworth. 21/-. 1945.)

ies ends which are desirable and therefore valuable in medicine, educa-
, industry, and in the spheres of sociology and politics. When moral
osophers have reached agreement on the *summum bonum* or supreme
e, we shall be in a better position to distinguish between ends and means,
ne meantime they are nearly always relative, and we have to be ready
e engaged on a means to modify the end at which we are aiming. I
ld stress Professor Flugel's own words in which he describes the change
he modern approach to what formerly was regarded as a world of in-
sic values:

'The substitution of the psychological for the moral point of view in any matter implies also a change in mental attitude—a change from a relatively emotional attitude to a relatively intellectual one. Scientific judgment is primarily a cognitive process, moral judgment—in this respect like judgment in matters of religion or aesthetics—primarily an orectic process. But with regard to difficult and delicate problems, cognition is often more effective than orexis.*

. . . . With the development of psychology, this restriction of moral judgment and the substitution of judgment in terms of psychological insight is rapidly increasing, even in our dealings with fellow human beings, and for much the same reason as elsewhere, namely that it is so often more effective.' (pp. 14, 15).

cho-analysis, originating as an applied science in medicine, is thus pro-
ling to the enlargement of our understanding and more effective living
very realm, and as we consider its spread in literature, art, religion,
morals, we are compelled to agree with Jung, 'that the Freudian psycho-
lysis is not only a scientific endeavour and achievement, but a psychical
ptom.' It is a symptom which we dare not ignore of man's need in
present day to understand himself anew, and to free the forces in him
n the repressions of an increasingly mechanized and specialized civiliza-
which in every department is damaging his soul. The wide prevalence
neurosis does at least suggest that the Censor as the guardian of morality
n overreaches himself in his appeal for a moral athleticism beyond man's
acity. This mostly unconscious Censor indeed appears as a rigid, infan-
archaic institution often lamentably out of touch with the realities of
lt life personal and social. He fails to preserve the distinction between
ere wish, an act, or a definite intention, and on investigation many of
human difficulties have been proved to be due as much to the stubborn,
id opposition of unadaptable, repressive moral tendencies as to the
norous exigency of crude unsocial instincts. There is therefore a general
d of a new and wider moral attitude based on rationality and knowledge
ier than the authoritarian assumptions of those who worship without
areness the products of their unconscious mind.

An idea of the richness and relevance of this book is given by a glance some of the nineteen chapter headings. These include Psychology and rals, Conscience and Will, Conflicts in the Ego-Ideal, Sado-Masochism, oo and its Equivalents, Vicarious Punishment, Projection of the Super-o, the Problem of Religion, of Social Attitudes, and of War and Peace. th regard to the question whether there exists an innate moral sense or ver of moral inhibition Flugel says:

'More recent evidence from psychology, psychopathology, physiology, and anthropology has led most modern writers to consider that

* 'Orexis,' adjective 'orectic,' an Aristotelian term to describe the feeling, striving and ning aspects of the mind, as distinguished from the reasoning, knowing and perceiving ects, known as 'cognition.'

the inherited elements in character, though undoubtedly present, are of a simpler kind than that suggested by such a term as "moral sense" . . . . The ultimate factors in morality are certainly more elementary than anything we should naturally understand by "moral sense," but whatever they are we know as yet very little as to how far they are innately determined.' (p. 200f.)

On the projection of feelings of guilt on to a scapegoat the following is illuminating:

'The infliction of vicarious punishment can become a very pleasant process. With each blow that we inflict upon the guilty party we feel that our own conscience is lightened; in our "righteous indignation" we satisfy at one and the same time our primitive aggressiveness, the disapproval of our super-ego (now, however, no longer directed against ourselves), and our sadism (which finds itself free in this situation to indulge in its peculiar satisfaction without incurring censure).' (p. 164f.)

We are able to distinguish three stages in the process of moral development:

'First, in the process whereby, as the child grows up, he learns to substitute his own moral judgment for that of the adults around him . . . . Secondly, the process is continued, within the individual mind, in the gradual taking over by the ego, with its capacity for reason, discrimination, and delicate adaptation to reality, of the control which at a lower level is exercised more blindly and indiscriminately by the super-ego. In the third place, within society, the individual members come to rely more on their own intelligence and moral judgment and less on taboos, conventions, laws, and the other methods of social restraint . . . . One important difference between primitive and civilized society lies in the greater individualization of the latter.' (p. 252.)

It will be obvious from the above quotations, backed as they are by a wealth of learning systematically presented, that here is a book which not only marks the changes in present-day ethical thought, but in presenting them will shape the course of tomorrow. Whether we agree or disagree, we should at least seek to understand the dynamisms at work within the human mind in ethics and in religion, since it is in these realms that the largest assumptions are made often without any critical examination. The lack of faith to-day in many things formerly held sacred is not always a sign of wickedness, but is often a sign of a growing moral sensitiveness. We have to distinguish, as Flugel points out, between the two elements in religion, *viz.*, a series of intellectual beliefs concerning the nature of the universe and the powers that govern it, and the provision of means for the mobilization of emotion. Even though the beliefs may all be false, the emotional aspects may still be of great importance, and Jung would even claim that the emotions are so important that they afford a sort of pragmatic justification for the beliefs, however erroneous or absurd these might appear when judged by a purely intellectual standard. We cannot, however, thus permit truth to be hustled off the stage by the dancing Dervish of emotionalism. The need to think clearly before we begin to feel deeply must first be met before we can advance along the way of effective living. And it is largely because of the unreadiness of religious people to meet this need that leads Professor Flugel to conclude:

'The religious emotions must be largely or entirely secularized and be put in the service of humanity. The religion of humanity is surely the religion of the nearer future.' (p. 275.)

'If we seek to achieve a morality that is free as regards feeling and behaviour as well as free from metaphysical constraints, it is not suffi-

cient to abandon what we may consider outworn superstitions and beliefs as regards the external aspects of the Universe. We have also to free ourselves from the archaic aspects of our own internal super-ego.' (p. 188.)

is, I think, significant that when Jung sent out a questionnaire asking, Would you in a serious difficulty of life, seek the advice of a physician alified in psychology, or a priest or minister of the Gospel?' The answers m Protestants were overwhelmingly in favour of the doctor, the chief son given being that ministers of the Gospel were bound by traditional, gmatic religious ideas. The Catholics preferred to consult the priest.

T. WIGLEY.

PRINCIPAL WHEELER ROBINSON*

Henry Wheeler Robinson, by Ernest R. Payne, is the life story of a scholar d tutor who, born in very humble circumstances, rose to academic eminence. is a gratifying narrative from various points of view. It is a proof and re are many that our English life offers *une carrière ouverte aux talents* those whose mental powers, moral character, and persevering loyalty to ir chosen career entitle them to promotion: it demonstrates the great part ich our Free Church denominations have played in providing a favourable vironment for those of lowly origin who possess the potentialities of success. also provides evidence of the immensely influential contribution which se denominations have made in furnishing a practical Christian environ-nt to large bodies of middle-class English people who are not attracted d influenced by the ministrations of the National Church. If the Noncon-mist bodies are losing their influence to-day in the religious, social and litical life of England it is a calamity to be deplored by those who recognize e part which the Christian religion has played in forming the national aracter.

Adopted in early life by a relation who was an ardent adherent of a Baptist apel in the Midlands, Wheeler Robinson found his intellectual, moral and ritual home in this environment and was early attracted to the career of Baptist minister.

In 1891, at the age of nineteen, he entered Edinburgh University and aduated M.A. in 1895. During this period he evinced remarkable intel-tual ability and after leaving Edinburgh he spent semesters at Marburg d Strassburg Universities where he mastered German and French. He next came a member of Mansfield College, Oxford, at that time under the spiring principalship of Dr. Fairbairn. In 1900 he became Baptist minister Pitlochry and passed thence to a pastorate in Coventry. He was appointed tor on the staff at Rawdon College, Yorkshire, in 1906. In this new sphere soon became known as a Biblical scholar and produced his Commentaries *Deuteronomy* and *Joshua* in the *Century Bible.* This was followed by *The ristian Doctrine of Man* (1911) and *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament* 913). He also produced three very interesting monographs on the religious nificance of suffering: *The Cross of Job* (1916), *The Cross of Jeremiah* 925), and *The Cross of the Servant* (1926). His two outstanding contri-tions are his two later works *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* 928) and *The History of Israel: its facts and factors* (1938).

From his tutorship at Rawdon he became Principal of Regent's Park llege, London, for the training of Baptist ordinands. When it was resolved move this institution to Oxford, Wheeler Robinson moved with it to its w destination. Strange as it must seem, in view of his future popularity

* *Henry Wheeler Robinson*: A Memoir by Ernest R. Payne. (Nisbet. 12/6. 1946.)

and outstanding success, his appointment was viewed with suspicion and even apprehension by influential members of his denomination. Mr. Payne writes:

> 'For three or four years there was uncertainty as to whether the annual grant would be made, or whether a major heresy hunt would develop with the College and its Principal as the storm centre.' (p. 74).

Dr. Wheeler Robinson's profound Christian faith and frank tactfulness and great educational and administrative abilities, enabled him to outride the storm, and long before his resignation in 1942 he had the wholehearted support and admiration of his denomination solidly behind him. In the early days of the Regent's Park translation to Oxford, Dr. Selbie, the Congregationalist Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford, by his hospitable helpfulness did much to assist the establishment of the new theological college in Oxford.

The buildings of the new Regent's Park College, solid, simple, well-designed, made a most favourable impression. It seemed a pity to many that a new designation could not have been given to the college with its new buildings; some name derived from the writings of John Bunyan (whom we suppose all would acknowledge to have been the greatest of the Baptists) might well supply what the college needs.

As the years passed, its Principal became an increasingly influential personality in the life of Oxford, and was appointed to many posts of honour in the University.

Beloved by his students, honoured by his academic contemporaries, he laid truly and far-sightedly the foundations of an institution of religion and sound learning, which has already enriched the theological life of the University. We venture to conclude this notice of a self-made man with his own words cited by Mr. Payne as the introduction to his Principal's life.

> 'We are born in debt and we never become solvent. Every life has had more invested in it than it can possibly repay. The whole universe brings its forces to a focus in one blade of grass, that it may grow to maturity. Uncounted aeons have gone to the giving of conscious life to each of us. The stars hang over every cradle, and wise men from East and West and South and North gather round it, in the spiritual inheritance they have bequeathed to it.'

The Biography, we ought to add, includes six hitherto unpublished addresses which his students will be glad to possess.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

BISHOP HEADLAM

Sir,

May one whom he ordained do homage to the memory of a beloved Father in God? Arthur Headlam, strong and independent, humorous, kind and wise, was able, as few men are able, to help others. His insight and practical sympathy were quite remarkable. He cared nothing for ecclesiastical convention, but everything for the counsels of Christ, and no one in need ever turned to him in vain.

One or two personal reminiscences may not be out of place. I shall never forget our first meeting at the Palace, Gloucester. Dr. Headlam was about to turn 80, but his fine presence, handsome face and alert mind would have made many a younger man shrink to insignificance beside him. Almost his first words were, 'You call yourself a Church of England man like

Like me you are not tied up with any party. But you do not wish, do to deny a place in our Church to the Anglo-Catholics or the Evangeli- or the Modernists? There is room for them all. That is the glory of Church of England, which you see reflected in me.' And he burst into ugh which seemed to shake the Palace walls.

ast before my ordination he called me into his room and said, 'I think are rather a self-opinionated young man.' 'My Lord,' I replied, 'I you are a very self-opinionated old man.' 'Quite right, too,' he ned, 'all the best people are self-opinionated,' and he shook my hand n and again. 'Now,' he went on, 'I have one piece of advice to give You must never be subservient to anyone, not even to me.'

ccasionally he called upon me to act as his chaplain, a rare privilege. ll never forget the look on his face while he was confirming. Particu- do I remember a confirmation at Leckhampton Church one autumn. His seemed aglow with beauty and joy as he laid his hands on the young le kneeling before him. He loved the young. Power seemed to go from him as it did from Our Lord. He ate a huge tea afterwards. appetite was truly amazing.

s the Bishop of Durham rightly said of him at his funeral, what he he meant, and he took the trouble to form his opinion before he gave But something must be added. The divine irony of the Founder of stianity was strong upon him. In his controversial pronouncements was always a vein of humour which many good but dull people failed etect.

Dr. Headlam once wrote an excellent little book, *What it means to be a stian.* But to understand what it means I have no need to peruse its s. I have only to think of him and his beautiful smile. J.R.H.T.

We gladly publish this appreciation of Dr. Headlam. Although his ner was autocratic, even rude, he possessed great kindness of heart. A l graduate of Oxford, having secured a title in his diocese, Dr. Headlam ined him, and at the ordination retreat spent much of his time in talking m and reading to him. He was absolutely fearless and said and did many gs which provoked resentment, but he never hesitated to defend the weak nst the strong and unpopular causes against overwhelming majorities. despised the slippery and subservient. He practised generous and dutiful pitality — not least in the case of those unable to return it. He had a great rd for sound learning and made valuable contributions to it. His Bampton ures on 'The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion' are a very and comprehensive contribution to the cause of Christian unity. He essed a great love of flowers and a surprising knowledge of them. A iculturist took him round his place and as he was shown one rare flower r another the Bishop recognized it and named it. 'At last,' said the iculturist, 'I showed him one I felt sure he would not know.' 'Ah!' said Bishop, 'I saw that last when I was crossing Mongolia.' He possessed gift of sardonic humour. He had spent some time in digging in Asia Minor Sir William Ramsay. Someone present said: 'What a remarkable aeologist Ramsay was!' 'Yes, indeed,' said the Bishop, 'he made it ,' and added 'but he was a Scotsman.' He loved the Church of England understood it in the way in which Dean Church and Mandell Creighton erstood it, but he also loved the Greek Orthodox Church and worked hard ring about closer relations between the two Churches. Is it possible that descent from Peter the Great had something to do with this? His appoint- t to the episcopate, although it surprised some, was fully justified. His inistrative powers were great and he loved his rural diocese.—ED., *M.C.*]

Sir,

ARCHIBALD FRANCIS ROBSON

The Liberal cause in the Church has lost a faithful adherent by the death of the Rev. Archibald Francis Robson, one of four clerical brothers the sons of Canon W. F. Robson.

A graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, he was successively assistant Diocesan Inspector of Schools at Rochester, Succentor of Southwark Cathedral, examining chaplain to the Bishops of Coventry and Hereford, and from 1921 to 1944 Vicar of Hemel Hempstead. A schoolfellow of Lord Birkenhead, it was his duty as prefect to 'tund' the future Lord Chancellor on a number of occasions. Lord Birkenhead, in a spirit of gratitude on attaining the Lord Chancellorship, offered to his former schoolfellow the first attractive Crown patronage which it was his duty to administer. A diligent and tactful parish priest, Mr. Robson won the high regard of his parishioners at Hemel Hempstead and while there published a volume of sermons: *The Gospel of the Knowledge of God.* He was a staunch member of the St. Alban's Branch of the Modern Churchmen's Union. He died at Malvern. His funeral took place in St. James's Church, West Malvern.

E.G.W.

Sir,

PROFESSOR KIRSOPP LAKE

I knew Kirsopp Lake intimately in his young days when he was a curate in Oxford. One Sunday evening he preached a sermon in the University Church to a congregation of what undergraduates would call 'townees' in which he described the Story of the Fall as a myth. This caused no small disturbance. From that day forward the parochial clergy of Oxford (except his own Vicar and Carteret Fletcher, Vicar of Carfax) used to cut him in the street. When I asked him to preach for me he told me that nobody outside his own parish had asked him to preach for two years. He had a warm supporter in Archdeacon Charles (of apocalyptic fame), who was intensely indignant that he received no promotion in England. When he had been some little time at Leyden Lake told me that while in England he was regarded as a dangerous theological radical. In Holland he was regarded as a timid Conservative.

Colchester. ERIC R. BUCKLEY.

Sir,

M.C.U. AREA COMMITTEES

In the list of members of the M.C.U. which has just been circulated there is an interesting and suggestive note stating that the formation of a small Area Committee has proved to be an excellent preliminary step towards the inauguration of a local branch. May I, as an eye witness, furnish the proof?

First, however, it should be noted that the Council, as part of its post-war plans for promoting and extending the work and influence of the Union has approved a scheme for the setting up of Area Committees and that the Council will, as I am informed, welcome any initiative from members in working this scheme.

The function of an Area Committee is to promote the formation of a branch in areas in which at present no branch exists; to give any help and guidance that it can to a branch or branches when formed and, generally, to act as a sort of agent for the Council in that area. The last-named function implies that an Area Committee does not become *functus officii* on the formation of a branch.

Now for the proof. This is what has happened in a Diocese in which there was not and never had been a branch of the M.C.U. A lay member of the Union who had no personal acquaintance with any other member in

Diocese drew a bow, more or less at a venture, and with the knowledge approval of the Secretary of the Union communicated with a clerical nber in the same area with a view to discussing the possibility of form an Area Committee. A correspondence ensued as a result of which other clerical members were consulted. It appeared that all four mem- were willing to act as an Area Committee if approved by the Council. was reported to the Secretary, who obtained the approval of the ncil. The Committee of four then elected a Chairman and Convener and eeded to business. The Secretary having furnished them with an nce copy of the list of members in their area, they decided to arrange a day conference of members and any other interested friends whether licans or Free Churchmen. One of the clerical members of the Area mittee kindly made his Church Room available for the conference which for a morning and afternoon session with a picnic lunch (each person ging his own) in between. The morning session was devoted to an ess on the need for a liberal outlook in religion and discussion upon theme. The afternoon session was devoted to the consideration of the nation of a branch. The result was entirely successful. A branch was ed fully equipped with Chairman, Treasurer and Secretary and the mem- then adjourned to celebrate the event over a pleasant tea at a local I. Q.E.D.

H. F. WALKER

Glenhurst, Arnside, Westmoreland.

THE PLAIN MAN'S RELIGION

As a comparatively new member of your Union, who is approaching logy for the first time and very much 'from the outside,' I venture write to you about a difficulty which I have experienced in reading the few issues of your magazine, and when attending the last Annual Con- nce. At that Conference it was several times stated that the ordinary is prepared to accept Jesus as a man but is not prepared to consider all elaborate theological speculations that have been built up around his on; and in your magazine it is constantly affirmed that the ordinary man ttracted by the human personality of Jesus. In the last issue in parti- r, it was stated that 'the plain man does think of our Lord as a real ' (this was in the review of Leslie Weatherhead's book). What worries sir, is that the mind of the plain man as I know it does not run along e lines at all. This may be the way that the average secondary school- sees the world, but the 'ordinary man' is surely a working man who er attended a secondary school. Such a man, as far as I have found, ar from being the rationalist who sees Jesus as a very good man; he is far from that as he is from the orthodox Christian view of Jesus. I le lived all my life among such ordinary men and women, and most of n are quite frankly riddled by superstitious fear. They don't usually to church very often, but they have an almost 'totem-pole' reverence religion—the sort of thing that makes women afraid to go out after ing a child until they have been 'churched,' lest the wrath of God ll them. I myself was brought up to believe that if I said 'Blimey!' ould be struck blind, because it really meant 'God blind me!' Indeed, e was a strong tradition in the district where I lived to the effect that an actually had been struck blind for this reason within living memory, radition which is firmly held there still. Jesus to such people is no real . He is, quite literally, God—the same God who is liable to strike one n with lightning or—most horrible of all—visit your children with ases—if you dare to say you are an atheist. Exactly why he came to

earth and went through the motions of the Passion is one of the things one 'ought not to be curious about'; the fact is that he did, and we had better be careful to observe (some of) the things that (we are told) he said. The 'plain man,' in other words, is a highly superstitious docetist; and while I am in full agreement with the policy of the Modern Churchman's Union in stressing the humanity of our Lord, I am very much afraid that you are not starting far enough back, where the plain man is.

I should be very grateful indeed, sir, for your opinion on this matter, or the opinion of other readers of your magazine, as it is the biggest difficulty I have encountered in trying to commend Christianity to people of my own class. Before I conclude, I should just like to mention a novel which seems to me to represent most faithfully the superstitious outlook of the ordinary man even to-day—I refer to H. G. Wells' last novel, *You can't be too careful.* I have never read a book which portrayed quite so well the people I spend my life with.

JOHN WREN-LEWIS

13 Corporation Street, Rochester, Kent.
January 30th, 1947.

THE GOSPEL FOR A WORLD OF DOUBT

SIR,

I suggest the following propositions:—

(1) If the best things could be 'proved,' so that certainty replaced uncertainty, moral choice and value judgments would be unnecessary and would soon cease to be one of our activities. As it is we are forced *to choose* whether we like it or not.

(2) Could the other regions of consciousness survive this loss?

(3) Choice involves the Will; Dr. Johnson said, 'All theory is against the freedom of the Will, all experience for it.' In my view it is enough if we cannot help *thinking* it is free. And what man does not when he acts?

(4) The Constitution of the Universe is orderly; whether we impose the order by our own minds, or select it, or whether it is really part of the Constitution of Things, we are forced to abide by that order.

(5) If a man chooses against the Constitution of Things he is hitting a brick wall.

(6) Those who survive the brick wall may come to see that their Will or Choice was wrong, so they come to 'a better will more wise.'

(7) In theological terms God could not permit to the wrong will a *final* triumph, but unless he permits the exercise of it the Freedom of the Spirit vanishes. The *event* is—at long last—overruled but *not* our choice before it.

(8) *Thinking* about wrong choices is absolutely necessary to decide on the right course but when this thinking turns into intention to act Sin is already present.

Thus I think that doubt and uncertainty about the best things is actually *necessary* in order to keep the mind alive. When we reach a right choice then our Will is His Will and we are free, since we should never wish to choose against the Constitution of Things.

As a writer to the *Spectator* said some time ago: God can help us only when our Will is set in the right direction—*but we have to find out that direction.* There is no short cut and no 'proof' in the usual meaning of the term. If we were not *forced* to find out by the constant exercise of moral choices consciousness, as we understand it, might not survive.

C. S. D'ESTE STOCK

Hotel Jungfrau, Mürren, Switzerland.
February 2nd, 1947.

THE CASE OF DR. SIMCOX

Arising from your comments on the pamphlet *Is the Roman Catholic urch a Secret Society?* perhaps you will print the enclosed letter from . Arnold Lunn to me. Mr. Lunn thinks I have been unfair to him in printing it in the pamphlet. I would gladly have printed it as I printed . Winch's speech at the Catholic Society of University College only t, owing to the fact that Mr. Lunn refused to correspond with me, I ld not be sure what his final wishes were about this letter. If you will v print it, you will be helping to put right the injustice Mr. Lunn thinks ave done him.

I resigned from work as a Catholic Priest in January, 1945. As I was the middle of my final preparations for leaving Buntingford, Mr. Lunn ote to me raising the point, which he might have raised four months lier when I should have had leisure to deal with it, that I had been lty of 'mischievous and irresponsible falsehood' in accusing him of ieving in two kinds of Catholic Truth—an 'academic' truth to be taught the seminary and another, exactly its opposite, to be put forward in olic when 'the salvation of souls is at stake.' Busy, worried and dis-ssed as I was when his letter reached me on January 13th, I replied by urn of post indicating three specimen passages in his letters in which seemed to commit himself to this theory of two kinds of Catholic Truth. January 21st I had typed out and sent him copies of the three passages h a commentary stating my deductions from them. At the end of uary he replied, in an undated letter, which I enclose, and which, ether with my notes on it, I hope you will agree to print.

JOHN V. SIMCOX

Copy of Mr. Lunn's Letter, January, 1945.

AR FATHER SIMCOX,

Some of our correspondence I have already used up for the rough drafts articles, such letters, that is, as were not written on both sides. The rest an unassorted mass of unfiled papers, and nothing would induce me to d through it again, either your letters or mine.

You have a genius for extracting letters from busy men, for you write such a way as to suggest that unless your interpretation of what is said repudiated you will reserve the right to claim the point is conceded. The chbishop, wiser than I, has never sent you anything but formal acknow-gments asking you to come and see him, and therefore you are entirely ong in drawing any deduction from his letters, such as for instance the luction which you drew that he 'has steadily declined to repudiate a letter which Canon Mahoney, of St. Edmund's, put forward the claim that uth must bow before Authority.' I wish, therefore, to make it clear that ny of your future letters remain unanswered, you are not entitled to argue t I agree or disagree with anything you have said. The only deduction u will be entitled to make from any future refusal to reply is that I have further leisure for this correspondence.

You write a great deal about your devotion to truth, but you display eat talent for taking remarks out of their context and misinterpreting m. I therefore do not accept your statement that Canon Mahoney ever d that Truth should bow to Authority. Certainly I have never sug-sted, believed or asserted any such heretical doctrine.

Let me, I hope for the last time, restate my position. If I did not make s clear, as I should have done in the first instance, you must allow for fact that my letters were written in great exasperation because I bitterly ented your attack on the character of a man I revered, the late Cardinal

Hinsley. I thought I was writing to a man who would observe the usual code common among gentlemen, that a correspondence which was private should not be used for public quotation. At a very early stage you asked me if you could quote something to Coulton. I made it clear then what you could quote, and by implication what you could not. Had I known that you intended to provoke a public controversy I should have been at pains to write in such a way as to protect myself from misrepresentation. I do not give permission to quote anything I have written, or to comment on anything I have written; but if you insist on disregarding my wishes you may quote this letter, provided you reproduce the whole letter.

My position, then, is this:—

(1) Defined doctrine never changes, but the Church progressively obtains a clearer view of Revelation. It is therefore plain foolish (*sic*) to quote, as Coulton so often does quote, some bigoted theologian of the past as if his views were binding on modern Catholics.

(2) Cardinal Hinsley was responsible for a great change in the relations between the Church and Protestants in this country. He went far beyond what any theologian would have approved in the last century. I believe he was a true interpreter of a changing attitude.

(3) The late Cardinal would have been prepared, had the situation been reversed, to follow the Irish precedent and to concede to Anglicans the same rights in education as he demanded for Catholic schools. I have already quoted to you one Bishop who stated that unless he sincerely believed that such a policy would not only be just but consistent with Catholic principles he could not, in conscience, take part in our campaign for the schools. Such is also the view of the present Archbishop of Westminster. May I, without presumption, say that I too would not speak on a public platform on the schools question unless I believed that similar rights should be conceded to Protestants, if the situation were reversed, not as a matter of expediency but of right.

(4) I think it is probable that this view is still a minority view, but it is the view of a minority which is in the process of becoming a majority.

(5) It is untrue to say, as you say, that 'the one thing a general cannot demand of a soldier is desertion or cowardice.' He can also demand that he does not write to the Press to criticize the strategy of the command. When I was in the Army I could not write on political issues without the permission of the O.C. What the Cardinal resented was your butting into the education campaign and criticizing the Commanding Officer, and embarrassing him in the conduct of a campaign. You know as well as I do that your intrusion so far from serving the cause of truth would tell against it, because the net effect left on the mind of the British public would be that the Cardinal was being untruthful. How could anybody expect to make the ordinary member of the public understand the relationship between defined truth and changing interpretations, or the irrelevance of the 'rigorist' theologians to a world in which their views have gradually been abandoned?

To sum up. The Cardinal was proclaiming what he believed to be true. Only in your perverted imagination is there any question of suppressing inconvenient truths. Under no circumstances would I ever be a party to making any statement on behalf of the Church which I did not believe to be true.

Comment of Dr. Simcox on Mr. Arnold Lunn's letter.

There seems to me to be little or nothing to answer in the above letter; but, perhaps, you will allow me to make a few comments on the sheer impudence of some of its leading points.

1) After 'demanding' from me, at a most awkward time, 'quotations' h justified my 'mischievous and irresponsible falsehood,' Mr. Lunn has a single word to say about these quotations when supplied to him. I only suppose that he is unable to dispute my contention that the quota- s assert his belief in two kinds of Catholic Truth.

2) His letter simply states his own and the late Cardinal Hinsley's posi- without even attempting to show that this position is Roman Catholic. ed, Mr. Lunn concedes that the Cardinal 'went far beyond what any logian would have approved in the last century.' Nor does he name a single present century theologian who is racing ahead with the Car- l in his spectacular advance.

3) As to Cardinal Hinsley's truthfulness—his refusal to allow me even sk what Catholic teaching was about parental rights seems to me ly inconsistent with his professed belief in the right of non-Catholics to opinions. He was not in a position to exercise power over non- olics. Where he had the power, as in my case, he exercised it without consideration at all even for the most obvious rights of those subject im. His furtive suppression of my public question about his doctrine seems to me to show that he had no real belief in that doctrine.

4) So far from writing to Mr. Lunn 'a great deal' about my 'devotion ruth,' I had actually written to him that I did not regard myself as a cularly honest person, but that even such a one as I had to protest nst the present almost incredible dishonesty existing among Roman olics.

5) For my view that Roman Catholicism denies the moral right to ve error and to teach error I was relying not on 'some bigoted theolo- of the past,' but on the teaching of the Lateran Council of 1215 and e great nineteenth-century Popes. If this teaching is now to be aban- d, it will be a revolution in Roman Catholic thought rather than an tion of it. It will be the end, too, of our claim that the Church is *per eadem.*

5) As to my 'talent for taking remarks out of their context and mis- preting them,' which led Mr. Lunn to distrust my statement that Canon oney held that Truth should bow to Authority—I have printed Canon oney's letter in the pamphlet *Is the Roman Catholic Church a Secret ety?* (p. 31). Your readers can there read Canon Mahoney's statement hemselves and judge whether I have taken it out of its context or mis- preted it.

7) In June, 1944, being convinced that Mr. Lunn thought good enough ne arguments in which (since he would not allow them to be sent to Dr. ton) he did not himself believe, I wrote to him that I thought our corres- ence had better end. He replied by forcing on me a series of abusive s carefully marked 'private.' I saw no reason why I should permit Lunn to bully and to abuse me in the safety of a 'privacy' which he d on me against my will. Hence my public use of his letters. In my , many Roman Catholics are frightened into silence by the 'private confidential' bullying that Mr. Lunn used against me. The way to it is to make it public.

8) Regarding two minor points in Mr. Lunn's letter I wrote to him in as follows:—

'The Archbishop's steady refusal to repudiate Canon Mahoney's letter a fact, not a "deduction." If he has repudiated it, let him produce his udiation. I twice begged him to repudiate it.

'As to the Archbishop's policy of silence—I gathered from him in one our conversations that he rather prided himself that he had not been

fool enough to be drawn into written discussion with me. It struck m as a cunning rather than a magnanimous point of view. If the Arc bishop really believes that he has a sound case against me, it is a my tery to me why he will not put it in writing. I can only suppose that wh the results of your own, of Canon Mahoney's, and Mr. Hollis's writt efforts before him, he has judged it safer to put nothing in writing hi self. However damaging to himself such an attitude may be, he appa ently prefers it to the risk of committing himself to such positions as tho into which you, Canon Mahoney, and Mr. Hollis have been betrayed your attempts to defend the indefensible.'

To conclude, may I say that I shall be glad to discuss fully with M Lunn any point that he wishes to raise in more detail, if he can persua some magazine or newspaper to print our discussion?

SIR,

ANNUAL M.C.U. MEETING

May I inform your readers of the arrangements which have been ma for the annual service and meeting?

By the kindness of the Vicar, the Rev. E. S. Loveday, the Holy Co munion will be celebrated in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields on Tuesday, M 20th, at 11.45 a.m., when the sermon will be preached by the Rev. Can J. S. Bezzant and the collection will be for the Ripon Hall Exhibition Fun

The annual meeting will take place on the same day in the Fellowsh Hall, St. Martin's, at 2.45 p.m., and will be followed by an address whi Sir Cyril Norwood will deliver.

Members and friends are cordially invited to attend.

Nominations for the election to the Council should reach me, as w pointed out in the last issue of the magazine, not later than Tuesda April 22nd.

R. GLADSTONE GRIFFITH,
Hon. Secretary, M.C.U.

Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks.
March, 1947.

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1947

The Modern Churchmen's Conference for 1947 will be held at Westfi College, Hampstead, London, from Monday, September 22, to Saturda September 27. The Hon. Secretary of the Conference is Miss Irene Walk F.R.Hist.Soc., Churchill Court, nr. Bristol, to whom all applications sho be made for tickets, accompanied by fees.

The cost of the ticket is £3 15*s*. A reduction of 5/- is made for curat assistant teachers and students.

The theme of the Conference is :

Pressing Problems of Christian Thought and Practice.

The Presidential Address will be delivered by Sir Henry Self, K.C.M.(K.C.I.E., B.D., B.Sc.

H. D. A. MAJOR
(*Chairman of the Conference Committee*).

A CORRECTION

The phrase 'cheerfulness would come breaking through' (*Mode Churchman*, January, 1947, p. 304) was incorrectly attributed to Isa Walton. It is attributed in Boswell's Johnson to a certain Mr. Edwards:

'You are a philosopher, Dr. Johnson. I have tried too in my time be a philosopher, but I don't know how, cheerfulness was alwa breaking in.'

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President:

Sir CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt., President of St. John's College, Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

ry Rev. the DEAN OF ARMAGH.
JOHN BARRAN, Bart.
v. A. C. BOUQUET, D.D.
E MASTER OF THE CHARTERHOUSE.
e Hon. GILBERT COLERIDGE, M.A., J.P.
C. CROSS, Esq.
W. C. DAMPIER, F.R.S., Sc.D.
n. ARCHDEACON OF DERBY.
. Rev. the BISHOP IN EGYPT, M.A.
v. Canon L. E. ELLIOTT-BINNS, D.D.
JOHN G. ERVINE, Esq., LL.D.
v. Canon F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
v. Chancellor W. HALL, B.Sc.
v. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A., B.Sc.
v. G. L. H. HARVEY, M.A.
ofessor S. H. HOOKE, M.A., B.D.
ry Rev. W. R. INGE, K.C.V.O., D.D.,
F.B.A.
Rev. CHARLES JENKINSON, M.A., LL.B.
Sir LAWRENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
Very Rev. the DEAN OF KILDARE.
Rev. Canon H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.
Rt. Rev. the BISHOP OF MOMBASA.
Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
Rev. Canon C. E. RAVEN, D.D.
Rev. KARL REILAND, D.D.
Ven. ARCHDEACON OF ROCHESTER.
Rev. Canon T GUY ROGERS, M.C., B.D.
Very Rev. the DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S.
Sir A. H. SELF, K.C.M.G., K.B.E., C.B., B.A., B.Sc., B.D.
Rt. Rev. BISHOP SHEN OF SHENSI, B.D.
Rt. Rev. the BISHOP OF SINGAPORE, M.A.
THE MASTER OF THE TEMPLE.
Rev. F. R. TENNANT, D.D., B.Sc., F.B.A.
J. W. WALKER, Esq., O.B.E., F.R.C.S., F.S.A.

Members of the Council:

Messenger: R. B. HENDERSON, Esq., M.A., B.D.

The Rt. Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF TRURO.

F. AITCHISON, Esq.
ss A. M. ASHLEY, M.A.
v. H. BAILEY, M.A., C.F.
v. Chancellor J. S. BEZZANT, B.D.
ss M. K. BODY, B.A.
v. G. W. BUTTERWORTH, M.A., Litt.D.
v. A. G. COOMBS, M.A.
v. W. G. FALLOWS, M.A.
VICTOR FISHER, Esq.
v. C. S. GODFREY-THOMAS, B.A., C.F.
S. GOTCH, Esq., M.A.
Rev. Canon MARCUS KNIGHT, B.D.
Rev. R. H. PRESTON, M.A., B.Sc.
Rev. Canon I. T. RAMSEY, M.A.
Rev. F. I. L. REES, M.A.
Rev. W. RICHARDSON, M.A.
Rev. C. E. SEAMER, M.A.
Rev. Professor N. SYKES, D.Phil.
Rev. H. J. TRUEMAN, M.A.
Miss M. IRENE WALKER, F.R.Hist.S.
Rev. D. E. H. WHITELEY, B.A.
Rev. T. J. WOOD, M.A.

ce-Chairman and Hon. Secretary, to whom all communications as to membership, subscriptions, change of address, literature and business matters should be sent: Rev. R. G. Griffith, M.A., Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks. Phone: Steeple Claydon 35.

Assistant Secretary: E. J. SNOW, Esq.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 10/-; Life Membership £10. Free Churchmen n become Affiliated Members, minimum 10/-. Cheques should be made payable to The dern Churchmen's Union. Bankers: Barclays Bank, Market Square, Buckingham.

---

e aims of the Modern Churchmen's Union are:—

To affirm the progressive character of God's self-revelation, and the certainty that no truth can lead away from Him.

To proclaim Christ and His Gospel in the light of modern knowledge, endeavouring to give a clear meaning to all phrases which are open to ambiguous treatment.

To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to reject what is false and to restate what is true in her traditional dogmas.

To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.

To promote the study of the Bible according to modern critical methods, and to interpret its message in the light of such study.

To secure more regard for beauty and truth in Church Services and the use of language and customs in harmony with modern thought.

To promote the application of Christian principles in public as well as in private life.

To assert the right and duty of the laity to take a due share in the government and work of the Church.

To maintain the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England and to foster fellowship and co-operation both in Word and Sacrament with other Christian Societies.

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology and Philosophy

Edited by **L. P. JACKS**

Chief Articles for April 1947

1. **The Sickness of Christendom: a Reply to Professor Callander.** Arnold Lunn.
2. **Christianity Returns to the East.** G. Stephen Spinks.
3. **Damnation for Unbelief.** Count Perovsky-Solovovo.
4. **Bertrand Russell's History of Western Philosophy.** Principal R. Nicol Cross.
5. **A Disastrous Obsession in Peace-Making.** A. R. Cripps.
6. **Alfred Loisy's View of Christianity.** Hugh Brown, D.Litt.
7. **Paganism and Race Suicide.** G. A. McCleary, M.D.
8. **Christian Communism.** A. R. Williams.
9. **Teaching Religion.** C. F. Rathbone.
10. **Teaching Doctrine.** James Butterworth.
11. **Good and Bad Characters in Literature.** H. M. Wilson.

SUBSCRIPTION: TEN SHILLINGS NET PER ANNUM, POST FREE

Apply for free specimen copy

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LIMITED

40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON, WC1

RIPON HALL, OXFORD

Founder: Bishop Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., K.C.V.O.
Warden: The Right Rev. the Bishop of Truro.
Principal: The Rev. Canon H. D. A. Major, D.D., F.S.A.
Vice-Principal: Rev. L. B. Cross, M.A., Fellow of Jesus College.

RIPON HALL provides a training on modern lines for those seeking Holy Orders in any diocese of the Anglican Communion.

Ripon Hall is licensed for residence by the University of Oxford. This privilege permits its members, possessed of senior status, to pursue their theological studies in the University and to qualify for the Diploma and Degrees in Theology.

Full particulars of Courses, Fees, Exhibitions, etc., can be had on application to the Principal, Ripon Hall, Boars Hill, Oxford.

Laymen who desire a broad-minded, sympathetic, and well-educated Clergy can materially assist this end by contributing to the Exhibition Fund of Ripon Hall, and to its endowment.

CLERICAL STATIONERY

GIFT DAY ENVELOPES

OFFERING ENVELOPE BOOKLETS

Leach's

CLERICAL STATIONERY CO.,
ABINGDON-ON-THAMES.
(PHONE: ABINGDON 444.)

Please mention "Modern Churchman."

Printed in Great Britain at the Holywell Press, Oxford.